arXiv:1510.00669v4 [math.CT] 29 Sep 2016

THE FROBENIUS CONDITION, RIGHT PROPERNESS, AND UNIFORM FIBRATIONS

NICOLA GAMBINO AND CHRISTIAN SATTLER

Abstract. We develop further the theory of weak factorization systems and algebraic weak factorization systems. In particular, we give a method for constructing (algebraic) weak factorization systems whose right maps can be thought of as (uniform) fibrations and that satisfy the (functorial) Frobenius condition. As applications, we obtain a new proof that the Quillen model structure for Kan complexes is right proper, avoiding entirely the use of topological realization and minimal fibrations, and we solve an open problem in the study of homotopical models of type theories, proving a constructive version of the preservation of Kan fibrations by pushforward along Kan fibrations. Our results also subsume and extend work by Coquand and others on cubical sets.

Introduction

This paper studies the Frobenius condition for weak factorization systems (wfs's), which asserts that pullback along a right map preserves left maps [3, 13]. One reason for the interest in this condition is that it is closely related to the right properness of a Quillen model structure, which requires that pullback along a fibration preserves weak equivalences. Indeed, for a Quillen model structure in which the cofibrations are the monomorphisms, such as the Cisinski model structures [9], right properness is equivalent to the Frobenius condition for the wfs of trivial cofibrations and fibrations. Furthermore, when pushforward along right maps exists, i.e. pullback along right maps has a right adjoint, the Frobenius condition is equivalent to the preservation of right maps by pushforward along a right map. In the category of simplicial sets, this amounts to the preservation of Kan fibrations by pushforward along Kan fibrations, a fact that plays an important role in Voevodsky's simplicial model of univalent foundations [27].

Our development begins by introducing a general notion of fibration, which subsumes that of a Kan fibration in simplicial and cubical sets, building on ideas in [9]. We then construct wfs's that have fibrations as the right maps we show show that satisfy the Frobenius condition. For this, we work in the setting of a category $\mathcal{E}$ equipped with a functorial cylinder, satisfying appropriate assumptions. For a suitable wfs $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$ in $\mathcal{E}$, to be thought of as consisting of cofibrations and trivial fibrations, we define a fibration to be a map with the right lifting property with respect to the maps, called here open cylinder inclusions, obtained as (a generalized form of) pushout product between the endpoint inclusions of the functorial cylinder and maps in Cof. We then show that there exists a wfs that has fibrations as right maps (Proposition 2.6) and satisfies the Frobenius condition (Theorem 3.8).

When applied in the category of simplicial sets, with the wfs of monomorphisms and trivial Kan fibrations [31] as $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$, fibrations in our sense are exactly Kan fibrations. Therefore, our results yield a proof that the wfs of trivial cofibrations and Kan fibrations satisfies the Frobenius condition, and so give a proof of right properness of the Quillen model structure for Kan complexes which avoids entirely topological realization, used in [21], and minimal fibrations, used in [25].

We then obtain analogous results for algebraic weak factorization systems (awfs's) [16, 19]. In an awfs, the left and right right maps do not just satisfy a lifting property, but are equipped with a natural family of solutions for lifting problems. The technical ingredient underpinning this idea is to express algebraic orthogonality not just with respect to a class of maps in a fixed category $\mathcal{E}$, but with respect to a category $\mathcal{I}$ equipped with a functor, which is often an inclusion or a forgetful functor, $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, where $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ is the arrow category of $\mathcal{E}$. For example, when $\mathcal{E}$ is a presheaf category it is natural to define a uniform trivial cofibration to be a right map with respect to the category of monomorphisms and pullback squares, considered with the evident inclusion into $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$. Unfolding the relevant definitions, a uniform trivial cofibration is a map equipped with diagonal fillers for lifting problems against monomorphisms, with the fillers satisfying a naturality condition with respect to pullback squares between monomomorphism. The presence of this algebraic structure remedies some unsatisfactory aspects of wfs's (such as the failure of orthogonality classes to be closed under all colimits), something that has proved to be useful for applications (see [2, 15, 17] or [1, 5, 11, 30, 33] for examples). The Frobenius condition has a natural counterpart in this context, called the functorial Frobenius condition [3], which requires that the pullback along right maps not only preserves left maps but also preserves morphisms between them.

Starting from a suitable awfs $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{t}})$, whose left and right maps are to be thought of as uniform cofibrations and uniform trivial fibrations, we define uniform fibrations by algebraic orthogonality with respect to a category having open cylinder inclusions as objects. We then show that there exists an awfs $(\mathsf{C}_{\mathsf{t}}, \mathsf{F})$ that has uniform fibrations as right maps (Theorem 6.5) and that satisfies the functorial Frobenius condition (Theorem 7.8). Therefore, pushforward along a uniform fibration preserves uniform fibrations (Corollary 7.9). An important technical step in this development is the characterization of when an algebraically-free awfs (in the sense of [16]) has the functorial Frobenius property (Theorem 5.9), which is somehow more elaborate than its counterpart for ordinary wfs's and is of independent interest.

In order to apply our algebraic results in simplicial sets and cubical sets, we show that, given a category of monomorphisms and pullback squares satisfying some mild assumptions, it is possible to construct an awfs $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{t}})$ satisfying the conditions necessary to apply our results (Theorem 8.1). Instantiating our definitions, we obtain the notion of a uniform Kan fibration which subsumes the one introduced in [11]. We then establish the existence of an awfs that has uniform Kan fibration as right maps and that satisfies the functorial Frobenius property, so that pushforward along a uniform Kan fibration preserves uniform Kan fibrations.

Since the proof of these results for simplicial sets and cubical sets is constructive, i.e. avoids the use of the law of excluded middle and the axiom of choice, we solve the open problem of obtaining a constructive version of the result asserting that, in simplicial sets, pushforward along Kan fibrations preserves of Kan fibrations. This problem was motivated by the question of whether Voevodsky's simplicial model of univalent foundations in [27] can be developed constructively. As shown in [6], this is not possible since the result on pushforward along Kan fibrations (which is essential to interpret the rules for Π-types) cannot proved constructively. This independence result has led the research community to shift its focus on models based on cubical sets and uniform Kan fibrations [1, 5, 11, 30, 33]. Indeed, in that setting it is possible to develop a constructive model of univalent foundations [11], showing in particular that pushforward along a uniform Kan fibration preserves uniform Kan fibrations. As our results show, the key aspect that makes it possible to obtain that result on pushforward is the idea of using the algebraic notion of a uniform Kan fibration, rather than working with cubical sets.

Furthermore, since our results apply also to cubical sets, we give a new proof of the fact that pushforward along a uniform Kan fibration preserves uniform Kan fibrations, avoiding entirely complex calculations with cubical sets, unlike the existing ones [11, 22],. Indeed, one of the initial

motivations for this work was to explore whether the theory of uniform fibrations in cubical sets could be developed at a greater level of generality, so as to make it applicable also to simplicial sets.

We also provide a characterization of uniform trivial fibrations in terms of the partial map classifer (Theorem 8.7), as suggested to us by Thierry Coquand and André Joyal. We then use this characterization to show in what sense the notion of a uniform (trivial) fibration subsumes the standard notion of a (trivial) fibration (Theorem 8.8) In particular, we prove that, in a presheaf category, a map can be equipped with the structure of a uniform (trivial) fibration if and only if it is a (trivial) fibration. As we observe in Remark 8.10, however, the algebraic notion of a fibration is essential for our results in Section 6 to hold constructively.

Remark. In the hope of making the paper more concise, we confine comments on constructivity issues to certain remarks and footnotes. However, let us point out here for the interested readers that our development does not rely on the law of the excluded middle or the axiom of choice, apart from Proposition 2.6, Theorem 6.5 and Theorem 8.1. For Theorem 6.5 and Theorem 8.1, we argue that the result holds constructively for simplicial sets and cubical sets separately, in Remark 8.4.

Organization of the paper. Section 1 introduces the setting in which we work throughout the paper. The core of the paper is then organized in two parts: the first part (Sections 2 and 3) studies wfs's; the second part (Sections 4 to 7) studies awfs's. In the first part, we introduce fibrations and establish the existence of the corresponding wfs in Section 2, and then prove the Frobenius property for this wfs in Section 3. In the second part, we begin by establishing basic facts about orthogonality functors (Section 4) and then establishing necessary and sufficient conditions for an algebraically-free awfs to satisfy the functorial Frobenius condition (Section 5). The rest of the second part then proceeds in parallel with the first part. Section 6 (parallel to Section 2) introduces uniform fibrations and establishes the existence of the associated awfs, while Section 7 (parallel to Section 3) proves the Frobenius property for uniform fibrations. We end the paper in Section 8 studying uniform (trivial) fibrations in presheaf categories and relating (trivial) fibrations and uniform (trivial) fibrations.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Steve Awodey, Thierry Coquand, Richard Garner, Simon Huber, André Joyal, Andrew Pitts, Emily Riehl, and Andrew Swan for helpful discussions and comments on earlier versions of the paper, to Marco Larrea Schiavon for pointing out an erroneous statement of Proposition 4.2 in an earlier version of this paper, and to Fosco Loregian for pointing us to a useful reference. This material is based on research sponsored by the Air Force Research Laboratory, under agreement number FA8655-13-1-3038, by a grant from the John Templeton Foundation, and by an EPSRC grant (EP/M01729X/1).

1. Background

Throughout the paper, we work with a category $\mathcal{E}$, assumed to be locally presentable and locally cartesian closed.In particular, $\mathcal{E}$ is cocomplete and finitely complete and pullback preserves all limits and colimits, since it has both a left adjoint and a right adjoint. For an arrow $f\colon X \to Y$, we write $f^*\colon \mathcal{E}_{/Y} \to \mathcal{E}_{/X}$ for the pullback along f, $f_!\colon \mathcal{E}_{/X} \to \mathcal{E}_{/Y}$ for its left adjoint, which is given by composition with f, and $f_*\colon \mathcal{E}_{/X} \to \mathcal{E}_{/Y}$ for its right adjoint, which we call pushforward along f. We write $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ for the category of arrows of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{\to}_{\mathrm{cart}}$ for the subcategory of $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ of arrows and cartesian squares.

Examples of such categories abound; in particular, our assumptions are satisfied not just by presheaf categories, but by arbitrary Grothendieck toposes. Our definitions and results are illustrated in two running examples. The first is the category **SSet** of simplicial sets, defined as the category of presheaves over the simplex category Δ. The second is the category **CSet** of

cubical sets of [11]. This is defined as the category of presheaves over the category $\square$ with objects of the form $\square^A$ with $|A| \in \mathbb{N}$ and morphisms $\square^A \to \square^B$ given by functions from B to the free de Morgan algebra on A. Thus, **CSet** has symmetries, diagonals, connections, and involutions. Note that the presence of symmetries precludes $\square$ from being a Reedy category. We stress that the only feature of the category $\square$ relevant for the main results are connections and symmetries. Thus, our results apply equally to many other variations of cubical sets, excluding however those considered in [5, 22], which do not have connections.

Recall from [26] that a *functorial cylinder* in $\mathcal{E}$ is an endofunctor $I \otimes (-)\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ equipped with natural transformations

$$\delta^0 \otimes (-)\colon \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}} \to I \otimes (-)\,, \quad \delta^1 \otimes (-)\colon \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}} \to I \otimes (-)\,,$$

called the left and right *endpoint inclusions*, respectively. Such a functorial cylinder is said to have *contractions* if $\delta^0 \otimes (-)$ and $\delta^1 \otimes (-)$ have a common retraction $\varepsilon \otimes (-)\colon I \otimes (-) \to \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}}$, making the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}} & \xrightarrow{\delta^0 \otimes (-)} & I \otimes (-) & \xleftarrow{\delta^1 \otimes (-)} & \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}} \\ & \searrow & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varepsilon \otimes (-)} & \swarrow & \\ & & \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}}\,. & & \end{array}$$

Further, a functorial cylinder with contractions as above has *connections* if, for $k \in \{0\,,1\}$, there is a natural transformations $c^k \otimes (-)\colon I \otimes I \otimes (-) \to I \otimes (-)$ such that the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} I \otimes (-) & \xrightarrow{\delta^k \otimes I \otimes (-)} & I \otimes I \otimes (-) & \xleftarrow{I \otimes \delta^k \otimes (-)} & I \otimes (-) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varepsilon \otimes (-)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle c^k \otimes (-)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varepsilon \otimes (-)} \\ \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}} & \xrightarrow[\delta^k \otimes (-)]{} & I \otimes (-) & \xleftarrow[\delta^k \otimes (-)]{} & \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}} \end{array} \tag{1.1}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} I \otimes (-) & \xrightarrow{\delta^{1-k} \otimes I \otimes (-)} & I \otimes I \otimes (-) & \xleftarrow{I \otimes \delta^{1-k} \otimes (-)} & I \otimes (-) \\ & \searrow & \downarrow{\scriptstyle c^k \otimes (-)} & \swarrow & \\ & & I \otimes (-) & & \end{array} \tag{1.2}$$

commute. We adopt the convention of associating the tensor product notation to the right. If the functor $I \otimes (-)\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ has a right adjoint $\exp(I, -)\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$, then we obtain a *functorial cocylinder*

$$(\exp(I, -), \exp(\bar{\delta}^0, -), \exp(\bar{\delta}^1, -))\,,$$

i.e. a functorial cylinder in the opposite category $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{op}}$ [26]. Contractions and (effective) connection carry over as well. In this case, note also that $I \otimes (-)\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ preserves colimits.

Our main examples of functorial cylinders with contractions and connections, discussed below, arise from a monoidal structure, written $(\mathcal{E}, \otimes, \top)$, and the presence of an *interval object*, i.e. an object $I \in \mathcal{E}$ equipped with maps $\delta^0, \delta^1\colon \top \to I$, called the left and right *endpoint inclusions*, respectively. In such a situation, a functorial cylinder is given by tensoring with I. It is immediate to isolate structures on the interval object that guarantee the presence of contractions and connections on the associated functorial cylinder: contractions are given by a map $\varepsilon\colon I \to \top$, connections by maps $c^k\colon I \otimes I \to I$, for $k \in \{0\,,1\}$, provided that suitable axioms hold. Note that if the unit $\top$ of the monoidal structure is a terminal object, then we have contractions in a canonical way.

EXAMPLE 1.1. In **SSet**, considered as a monoidal category with respect to its cartesian structure, an interval object is given by Δ^1 with endpoint inclusions $\delta^k\colon \{k\} \to \Delta^1$ given by special cases of horn inclusions, $\delta^k = h^1_k$, for $k \in \{0\,,1\}$. We have contractions since the monoidal structure is cartesian and uniquely determined connections $c^k\colon \Delta^1 \times \Delta^1 \to \Delta^1$, with $k \in \{0\,,1\}$, given on points by $c^0(x,y) = \min(x,y)$ and $c^1(x,y) = \max(x,y)$. For this, note that Δ^1 and $\Delta^1 \times \Delta^1$ are nerves of posets and that min and max are monotone.

EXAMPLE 1.2. The category $\square$ has a symmetric monoidal structure, which makes cubical sets into a symmetric monoidal closed category. In **CSet**, an interval object with contractions is given by $\square^1$ with endpoint inclusions $\delta^k\colon \{k\} \to \square^1$ given by the maps from a singleton set to the free de Morgan algebra on an empty set that pick the bottom element for $k = 0$ and the top element for $k = 1$. We have contractions since the unit of the monoidal structure is a terminal object. Connection operations $c^k\colon \square^1 \otimes \square^1 \cong \square^2 \to \square^1$ for $k \in \{0\,,1\}$ are given by the maps from a singleton set to the free de Morgan algebra on a two-element set $\{x\,,y\}$ that pick $x \wedge y$ and $x \vee y$, respectively).

For the remainder of this section and the next one, we work with ordinary wfs's [8] and use standard notation and terminology. For example, for a class I of maps in $\mathcal{E}$, we write $I^{\pitchfork}$ for the class of maps having the right lifting property with respect to all maps in I. As is well-known, we have inclusions

$$I \subseteq {}^{\pitchfork}(I^{\pitchfork})\,, \quad I \subseteq ({}^{\pitchfork}I)^{\pitchfork}. \tag{1.3}$$

Let us recall that the definition of the Frobenius property.

DEFINITION 1.3. We say that a wfs (L, R) has the *Frobenius property* if the pullback of an L-map along an R-map is again an L-map.

See [10] for an explanation of the connection with Lawvere's Frobenius condition [28]. As mentioned in the introduction, a Quillen model structure $(\mathsf{Weq}, \mathsf{Fib}, \mathsf{Cof})$ in which the cofibrations are the monomorphisms (such as the Quillen model structure for Kan complexes [31]) is right proper, i.e. the pullback of a weak equivalence along a fibration is again a weak equivalence, if and only if the wfs $(\mathsf{TrivCof}, \mathsf{Fib})$ of trivial cofibrations and fibrations has the Frobenius property.

We say that a wfs (L, R) is *free* on a class of maps I (not necesssarily a set) if $R = I^{\pitchfork}$. If this is the case, then $L = {}^{\pitchfork}(I^{\pitchfork})$. Of course, a wfs could be free on many different classes of maps. By Quillen's small object argument [31], every set I determines a wfs (L, R) free on I. These are what we call *cofibrantly generated wfs's*. The next proposition is used in the proof of Theorem 3.8 and provides the non-algebraic counterpart of Theorem 5.9, which is the main result of Section 5.

PROPOSITION 1.4. *Let (L, R) be a wfs that is free on a class of maps I. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) (L, R) has the Frobenius property.
(ii) For every $p\colon Y \to X$, pushforward $p^*\colon \mathcal{E}_{/Y} \to \mathcal{E}_{/X}$ preserves R-maps.
(iii) The pullback of an I-map along an R-map is an L-map. □

PROOF. The claims follow by standard properties of the interaction between lifting properties and adjoint functors. □

2. Fibrations

Let us now assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is equipped with a functorial cylinder $I \otimes (-)\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ with contractions and connections, and that $I \otimes (-)\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ has a right adjoint. The notion of a fibration that

we introduce and study in this section and the next is relative not only to $\mathcal{E}$ and its functorial cylinder, but also to a wfs on $\mathcal{E}$ satisfying some assumptions that we encapsulate in the notion of a *suitable wfs*, given in Definition 2.1 below. In order to state that definition, we need some notation. For $k \in \{0,1\}$ and a map $i\colon A \to B$ in $\mathcal{E}$, we define the *Leibniz product* [32] of the endpoint inclusion $\delta^k \otimes (-)$ and i to be the map

$$\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} i\colon (I \otimes A) +_A B \to I \otimes B$$

determined uniquely by the following pushout diagram:



We shall use Leibniz products with endpoint inclusions throughout the paper. In the next definition and onwards, we write $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$ to denote a suitable wfs, and refer to maps in Cof as *cofibrations* and maps in $\mathsf{TrivFib}$ as *trivial fibrations*; this helps to convey some of the basic intuition motivating our development.

Definition 2.1. A wfs $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$ is said to be *suitable* if the following hold:

(S1) $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$ is cofibrantly generated,
(S2) every object is cofibrant, i.e. for every $X \in \mathcal{E}$, the unique map $\bot_X\colon 0 \to X$ is a cofibration,
(S3) cofibrations are closed under pullbacks, i.e. for every pullback square



if $i \in \mathsf{Cof}$ then $j \in \mathsf{Cof}$,
(S4) cofibrations are closed under Leibniz product with the endpoint inclusions, i.e. for every $i \in \mathsf{Cof}$ we have $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} i \in \mathsf{Cof}$.

Example 2.2. By a result of Cisinski [9, Proposition 1.2.27], every presheaf category admits a suitable wfs whose cofibrations are the mononomorphisms. When $\mathcal{E}$ is a category of presheaves over an elegant Reedy category [4], a map has the right lifting property with respect to monomorphisms if and only if it has it with respect to boundary inclusions, since every monomorphism is an ω-composition of cobase changes of coproducts of boundary inclusions of simplices.

Let us now fix a suitable wfs $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$ in $\mathcal{E}$. We wish to define a new wfs, to be thought of as consisting of trivial cofibrations and fibrations. For this, we begin by defining the class of maps, called *open cylinder inclusions*, that determines the notion of a fibration. This class is defined by letting

$$\mathsf{Cyl} =_{\mathrm{def}} \{\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} i \mid k \in \{0,1\}\,,\ i \in \mathsf{Cof}\} \tag{2.1}$$

Definition 2.3. A *fibration* is a map with the right lifting property with respect to all open cylinder inclusions.

We then define a *trivial cofibration* to be a map with the left lifting property with respect to all fibrations. We write Fib for the class of fibrations and $\mathsf{TrivCof}$ for the class of trivial cofibrations, so that $\mathsf{Fib} = \mathsf{Cyl}^{\pitchfork}$ and $\mathsf{TrivCof} = {}^{\pitchfork}\mathsf{Fib}$. We illustrate these notions in our running examples.

Example 2.4. In **SSet**, let $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$ be the wfs of monomorphisms and trivial Kan fibrations, which is cofibrantly generated by the boundary inclusions. Then, a fibration in our sense is the same thing as a Kan fibration in the usual sense (proven in [12, Chap. IV, Sec. 2]). Explicitly, a fibration in our sense is a map with the right lifting property with respect to all maps of the form

$$h^1_k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} i \colon (\Delta^1 \times A) \cup (\{k\} \times B) \to \Delta^1 \times B \,,$$

given by the Leibniz product of an endpoint inclusion $h^1_k \colon \{k\} \to \Delta^1$ with a monomorphism $i \colon A \to B$. Note that this also induces lifts against any higher dimensional horn h^n_i since h^n_i arises as a retract of the Leibniz product $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} h^n_i$.

Example 2.5. In **CSet**, let $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$ be the wfs in which L consists of all monomorphisms. A fibration in **CSet** will be called a *Kan fibration*. To illustrate the relationship with the standard Kan filling condition for cubes, let $i^n \colon \partial\square^n \to \square^n$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote the boundary inclusion for $\square^n$, which is given by the n-fold Leibniz tensor of $[\delta^0, \delta^1] \colon \{0\,, 1\} \to \square^1$. Then $\delta^0 \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} i^n$ and $\delta^1 \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} i^n$ are the inclusions $\sqcup^{1+n}_1 \to \square^{1+n}$ and $\sqcap^{1+n}_1 \to \square^{1+n}$, respectively. Since the cube category has symmetries, a Kan fibration in **CSet** has the left lifting property also with respect to open box inclusions, which are counterparts in cubical sets of the horn inclusions in simplicial sets. The fibrant cubical types defined in [11] arise by considering the L'-fibrations where L' is the subclass of L spanned by monomorphisms[1] classified by their face lattice Φ, i.e. those arising as a pullback of $\{\top\} \to \Phi$, excluding for example diagonals in cubes. Note that L' is the left class of a suitable wfs and is thus covered by our development.

Proposition 2.6. $(\mathsf{TrivCof}, \mathsf{Fib})$ *is a wfs in* $\mathcal{E}$.

Proof. Let I be a generating set for the suitable wfs $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$. We define

$$J =_{\mathrm{def}} \{\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} i \mid i \in I\}.$$

By the small object argument, there is a wfs (L, R) cofibrantly generated by J, where L is the saturation of J (i.e. its closure under identities, composition, retracts, pushouts and transfinite composition) and $R = J^{\pitchfork}$. We claim that R is the class of fibrations, i.e. that $J^{\pitchfork} = \mathsf{Cyl}^{\pitchfork}$. Recall that Cof is the saturation of I. Since the Leibniz product $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (-)$ preserves all operations involved in saturation, the class Cyl and the set J have the same saturation (since the Leibniz product $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (-)$ preserves all the operations involved in saturation); they therefore have the same right orthogonal class. □

Note that, since Cof is closed under Leibniz products with the endpoint inclusions, we have that $\mathsf{TrivCof} \subseteq \mathsf{Cof}$, i.e. that every trivial cofibration is a cofibration.

Remark 2.7. We also relate the notion of a fibration introduced here with the notion of a naive fibration introduced by Cisinski [9]. For this, let $m \otimes (-) \colon \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}} + \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}} \to I \otimes (-)$ be given by

$$m \otimes (-) =_{\mathrm{def}} [\delta^0 \otimes (-), \delta^1 \otimes (-)] \,.$$

A *naive Cisinski fibration* would be defined as a map with the right lifting property with respect to the class

$$\mathsf{Cyl}' =_{\mathrm{def}} \{(m \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (-))^n (\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} i) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\,,\ i \in \mathsf{Cof}\}$$

[1] Or decidable monomorphisms, if working constructively.

Informally, one could think of this set as the closure of Cyl under Leibniz product with m.

Our reasons for working with Cyl instead of this class are twofold. First, if the functorial cylinder is induced by tensoring with an interval object in a symmetric monoidal category and Cof is closed under Leibniz product with the boundary inclusion $[\delta^0, \delta^1]\colon 1{+}1 \to I$, then by permuting the Leibniz product one sees that every fibration is a naive Cisinski fibration. This is the case in our main examples, where Cof consists of all monomorphisms, the map $[\delta^0, \delta^1]$ is a monomorphism, and Leibniz product preserves monomorphisms.

For our second point, we use some notions and results in Section 3. If we assume generalized connections (in the sense of $(1{+}n{+}1)$-ary operations that behave as connections for fixed middle n arguments), and that Cof is closed under Leibniz product with $[\delta^0, \delta^1]$ (for example, this is the case if $[\delta^0, \delta^1]$ is a monomorphism and the maps in Cof are the monomorphisms in a presheaf category), then the maps in Cyl can still be shown to be strong homotopy equivalences. This gives rise to an inclusion $\mathsf{Cof}' \to \mathsf{Cof} \cap S$ (where S is the class of strong homotopy equivalences that we define in Section 3). By Lemma 3.5, it then follows that every naive Cisinski fibration is a fibration.

3. The Frobenius property for fibrations

Our aim in this section is to show that the wfs $(\mathsf{TrivCof}, \mathsf{Fib})$ of Proposition 2.6 satisfies the Frobenius property. Our proof of the Frobenius property consists of three main steps. First, we introduce the notion of a *strong homotopy equivalence* (Definition 3.1) and give a characterization of strong homotopy equivalences as certain retracts (Lemma 3.3). Secondly, we show that the maps in Cof which are strong homotopy equivalences are retracts of maps in Cyl, and that every map in Cyl is both in Cof and a strong homotopy equivalence (Lemma 3.5). Thirdly, we show that the pullback of a strong homotopy equivalence along a fibration is again an strong homotopy equivalence (Lemma 3.7). With these facts in place, the Frobenius condition for $(\mathsf{TrivCof}, \mathsf{Fib})$ in Theorem 3.8 follows easily.

We begin by introducing strong homotopy equivalences. For this, we need to review some preliminary notions. Let $f, g\colon X \to Y$ be maps in $\mathcal{E}$. Recall that a *homotopy from f to g*, denoted $\phi\colon f \sim g$, is a morphism $\phi\colon I \otimes X \to Y$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\delta^0 \otimes X} & I \otimes X & \xleftarrow{\delta^1 \otimes X} & X \\ & {\scriptstyle f}\searrow & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi} & \swarrow{\scriptstyle g} & \\ & & Y. & & \end{array} \tag{3.1}$$

We say that a map $f\colon X \to Y$ is called a *left* (or 0-*oriented*) *homotopy equivalence* if there exist $g\colon Y \to X$ and homotopies $\phi\colon g \circ f \sim \mathrm{id}_X$, $\psi\colon f \circ g \sim \mathrm{id}_Y$. Dually, we have a *right* (or 1-*oriented*) *homotopy equivalence* if there exist $g\colon Y \to X$ and homotopies $\phi\colon \mathrm{id}_X \sim g \circ f$, $\psi\colon \mathrm{id}_Y \sim f \circ g$. The notion of a strong homotopy equivalence, defined below, is obtained by requiring an additional condition on the homotopies ϕ and ψ.

Definition 3.1. For $k \in \{0\,, 1\}$, a map $f\colon X \to Y$ is called a *strong k-oriented homotopy equivalence* if there is a map g and homotopies ϕ and ψ making f into a k-oriented homotopy equivalence such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I \otimes X & \xrightarrow{I \otimes f} & I \otimes Y \\ {\scriptstyle \phi}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi} \\ X & \xrightarrow[f]{} & Y. \end{array}$$

We write S_k for the class of strong k-oriented homotopy equivalences and let $S =_{\text{def}} S_0 \cup S_1$. Elements of S are called *strong homotopy equivalences*.

REMARK 3.2. The components of the endpoint inclusion $\delta^k \otimes (-)\colon \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{E}} \to I \otimes (-)$ are strong k-oriented homotopy equivalences. In fact, they are strong k-oriented deformation retracts, i.e. strong k-oriented homotopy equivalences for which the homotopy ϕ is trivial, i.e. $\phi = \varepsilon \otimes X$, where ε is the contraction of the functorial cylinder. To show this, one exploits crucially the assumption that the functorial cylinder has connections. For $k = 0$, the retraction is given by $\varepsilon \otimes X\colon I \otimes X \to X$ and the homotopy $\psi\colon (\delta^0 \otimes X) \circ (\varepsilon \otimes X) \sim 1_{I\otimes X}$ is given by the connection $c^0 \otimes X$. The axioms for the left and right endpoint of ψ follow from the left sides of (1.1) and (1.2), respectively. The axiom for strength follows from the right part of (1.1).

Our first step is to give an alternative characterization of strong k-oriented homotopy equivalences. For this, observe that we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\delta^{1-k}\otimes X} & I \otimes X & \xrightarrow{\iota_1} & (I \otimes X) +_X Y \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \delta^k \hat{\otimes} f} \\ Y & & \xrightarrow[\delta^{1-k}\otimes Y]{} & & I \otimes Y \end{array} \tag{3.2}$$

for $k \in \{0\,,1\}$. This diagram gives us (functorially in f) an arrow $\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f\colon f \to \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f$ in the category of maps in $\mathcal{E}$, which we use in the next lemma to provide a characterization of strong homotopy equivalences as retractions.

LEMMA 3.3. *A map $f\colon X \to Y$ is a strong k-oriented homotopy equivalence if and only if the map $\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f\colon f \to \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f$ exhibits f as a retract of $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f$, i.e. there are dotted arrows as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\iota_1\circ(\delta^{1-k}\otimes X)} & (I \otimes X) +_X Y & \dashrightarrow & X \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \delta^k \hat{\otimes} f} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ Y & \xrightarrow[\delta^{1-k}\otimes Y]{} & I \otimes Y & \dashrightarrow & Y\,, \end{array}$$

such that the two horizontal composites are identities.

PROOF. First, by a standard diagram-chasing argument, giving the square on the right is equivalent to giving maps $\phi\colon I \otimes X \to X$, $g\colon Y \to X$, $\psi\colon I \otimes Y \to Y$ such that the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\delta^k\otimes X} & I \otimes X \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi} \\ Y & \xrightarrow[g]{} & X, \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{g} & X \\ {\scriptstyle \delta^k\otimes Y}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ I \otimes Y & \xrightarrow[\psi]{} & Y, \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} I \otimes X & \xrightarrow{\phi} & X \\ {\scriptstyle I\otimes f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ I \otimes Y & \xrightarrow[\psi]{} & Y. \end{array} \tag{3.3}$$

Second, requiring that the two horizontal composites are identities means that the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\delta^{1-k}\otimes X} & I \otimes X \\ & \searrow & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi} \\ & & X, \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\delta^{1-k}\otimes Y} & I \otimes Y \\ & \searrow & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi} \\ & & Y \end{array} \tag{3.4}$$

commute. With reference to the diagram in (3.1), the equations in (3.3) provide endpoint k for ϕ and ψ, and strength, respectively; while the equations in (3.4) provide endpoints $1-k$ for ϕ and ψ, respectively. □

Note that strong k-oriented homotopy equivalences have better closure properties than strong k-oriented deformation retracts. For example, Lemma 7.1 implies that strong k-oriented homotopy equivalences are closed under retracts. Indeed, let f be a strong homotopy equivalence and g be a retract of f. Then, $\theta^k \hat{\otimes} g$ is a retract of $\theta^k \hat{\otimes} f$, since $\theta^k \hat{\otimes} (-)\colon \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ is a functor and functors preserve retracts. Since f is a strong homotopy equivalence, $\theta^k \hat{\otimes} f$ is a section. But then $\theta^k \hat{\otimes} g$ is a also a section (since sections are closed under retracts), and so g is a strong k-oriented homotopy equivalence.

Lemma 3.4. *For every f, we have that $\delta^k \hat{\otimes} f$ is a strong k-oriented homotopy equivalence.*

Proof. This is a diagram-chasing argument, similar to the one in Remark 3.2, which we omit for brevity (but see Lemma 7.4 for a structural proof). □

For our second step, we return to consider a suitable wfs $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$ and the induced wfs $(\mathsf{TrivCof}, \mathsf{Fib})$ of Proposition 2.6. We focus on the class $\mathsf{Cof} \cap S$, i.e. the class of cofibrations that are strong homotopy equivalences. We begin by relating them to the open cylinder inclusions defined in (2.1).

Lemma 3.5.

(i) $\mathsf{Cyl} \subseteq \mathsf{Cof} \cap S$.
(ii) $\mathsf{Cof} \cap S \subseteq \mathsf{TrivCof}$,

Proof. For part (i), we have $\mathsf{Cyl} \subseteq \mathsf{Cof}$ since cofibrations are closed under Leibniz product with δ^k (condition (S4) in Definition 2.1). Since functorial cylinder has connections, the map $\delta^k \hat{\otimes} f$ is a strong k-oriented homotopy equivalence for every $f\colon X \to Y$, as observed in Lemma 3.4. For part (ii), let $f \in \mathsf{Cof} \cap S$. Since $f \in S$, Lemma 3.3 implies that f is a retract of $\delta^k \hat{\otimes} f$ for some $k \in \{0\,,1\}$. Because $f \in \mathsf{Cof}$, we have $\delta^k \hat{\otimes} f \in \mathsf{Cyl}$. But $\mathsf{Cyl} \subseteq \mathsf{TrivCof}$ and $\mathsf{TrivCof}$ is closed under retracts. □

Remark 3.6. By Lemma 3.5, we have $\mathsf{Fib} = (\mathsf{Cof} \cap S)^{\pitchfork}$, i.e. a map is a fibration if and only if it has the right lifting property with respect to the cofibrations that are strong homotopy equivalences.

The next lemma is the third main step of the proof of the Frobenius property for $(\mathsf{TrivCof}, \mathsf{Fib})$.

Lemma 3.7. *For $k \in \{0\,,1\}$, the pullback of a strong k-oriented homotopy equivalence along a fibration is again a strong k-oriented homotopy equivalence.*

Proof. Consider a pullback diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{q} & A \\ {\scriptstyle j}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle i} \\ Y & \xrightarrow[p]{} & X, \end{array} \tag{3.5}$$

where $i \in S_k$ and $p \in \mathsf{Fib}$. We wish to show that $j \in S_k$. Since $i \in S_k$, $\theta^k \hat{\otimes} i\colon i \to \delta^k \hat{\otimes} i$ has a retraction $\rho\colon \delta^k \hat{\otimes} i \to i$. We show that $\theta^k \hat{\otimes} j\colon j \to \delta^k \hat{\otimes} j$ has a retraction $\tau\colon \delta^k \hat{\otimes} j \to j$. We define the retraction τ so that the diagram below commutes. Here, $\sigma\colon j \to i$ is the pullback

in (3.5) and the horizontal composited should be identities:



Since the pullback square σ is a cartesian arrow with respect to the codomain fibration, it suffices to solve this problem on codomains, again omitting horizontal composite identities:



To find the dotted arrow is to construct a diagonal filler in the following square:



But now $\delta^k \otimes X \cong \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} \perp_X$, where $\perp_X \colon 0 \to X$ is the unique map from the initial object of $\mathcal{E}$ into X, which is a cofibration by the assumption that $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{TrivFib})$ is suitable (condition (S2) of Definition 2.1). The required filler then exists since $\delta^k \otimes X$ is isomorphic to a map in Cyl and $p \in \mathsf{Fib} = \mathsf{Cyl}^{\pitchfork}$. □

THEOREM 3.8. *The wfs* $(\mathsf{TrivCof}, \mathsf{Fib})$ *has the Frobenius property.*

PROOF. By Proposition 1.4, it suffices to show that, for a pullback of the form



where $i \in \mathsf{TrivCof}$ and $p \in \mathsf{Fib}$, we have $j \in \mathsf{TrivCof}$. By part (ii) of Lemma 3.5, $i \in \mathsf{Cof} \cap S$. By the closure of Cof under pullbacks (condition (S3) of Definition 2.1) and Lemma 3.7, it follows that $j \in \mathsf{Cof} \cap S$. But $\mathsf{Cof} \cap S \subseteq \mathsf{TrivCof}$ by part (i) of Lemma 3.5 and the closure of $\mathsf{TrivCof}$ under retracts. □

EXAMPLE 3.9. When applied to the category of simplicial sets (see Example 2.4), Theorem 3.8 gives a new proof of right properness of the Quillen model structure for Kan complexes. This proof avoids the use of topological realization, which is used in [20, Theorem 13.1.13] to deduce the desired result from the right properness of the model structure on topological spaces in which the fibrations are the Serre fibrations. It also avoids the use of the theory of minimal fibrations, which is used in [24, Theorem 1.7.1] to establish the result working purely combinatorially.

4. Categories of orthogonal maps

This section starts the second part of the paper, in which we are interested in generalizations for awfs's of the results obtained earlier. In this section and the next we will need to review and establish some facts about the algebraic setting that are useful for our development. Importantly, in the algebraic setting we do not consider just classes of arrows in $\mathcal{E}$, but rather categories $\mathcal{I}$, to be thought of as indexing categories, and functors $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$. In the following, we write $u_i\colon A_i \to B_i$ for the effect of such a functor on $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Let us recall the following definition from [16].

Definition 4.1. Let $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$.

(i) A *right $\mathcal{I}$-map* $(f,\phi)\colon X \to Y$ consists of a map $f\colon X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{E}$ and a function ϕ that assigns to each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and commuting square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_i & \xrightarrow{s} & X \\ {\scriptstyle u_i}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ B_i & \xrightarrow[t]{} & Y \end{array}$$

a diagonal filler $\phi(i,s,t)\colon B_i \to X$, satisfying the following naturality condition: for every diagram of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A_i & \xrightarrow{a} & A_j & \xrightarrow{s} & X \\ {\scriptstyle u_i}\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle u_j}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ B_i & \xrightarrow[b]{} & B_j & \xrightarrow[t]{} & Y, \end{array}$$

where the left square is the image of $\sigma\colon i \to j$ in $\mathcal{I}$ under u, we have that

$$\phi(j,s,t) \circ b = \phi(i, s \circ a, t \circ b)\,.$$

(ii) A *right $\mathcal{I}$-map morphism* $\alpha\colon (f,\phi) \to (f',\phi')$ is a square $\alpha\colon f \to f'$ in $\mathcal{E}$ satisfying an evident compatibility condition with respect to the choices of diagonal fillers, which we omit.

For $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, we write $\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$ for the category of right $\mathcal{I}$-maps and their morphisms. We then let $u^{\pitchfork}\colon \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ be the evident forgetful functor, which we call the *right orthogonal* of u. Recall from [16] that the function mapping $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ to its right orthogonal $u^{\pitchfork}\colon \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ defines the action on objects of a functor of categories over $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$,

$$(-)^{\pitchfork}\colon \mathbf{CAT}^{\mathrm{op}}_{/\mathcal{E}^{\to}} \to \mathbf{CAT}_{/\mathcal{E}^{\to}}\,.$$

As shown in [16, Proposition 3.8], the orthogonality functors form an adjunction

$$\mathbf{CAT}_{/\mathcal{E}^{\to}} \underset{(-)^{\pitchfork}}{\overset{{}^{\pitchfork}(-)}{\underset{\longleftarrow}{\overset{\longrightarrow}{\bot}}}} \mathbf{CAT}^{\mathrm{op}}_{/\mathcal{E}^{\to}}\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Even if objects of $\mathbf{CAT}_{/\mathcal{E}^{\to}}$ are pairs of the form $(\mathcal{I},u)$, where $\mathcal{I}$ is a category $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ is a functor, in the following we shall often refer to them by their domains. A similar convention applies to maps in $\mathbf{CAT}_{/\mathcal{E}^{\to}}$. For example, we write the components of the unit and counit simply as

$$\eta_{\mathcal{I}}\colon \mathcal{I} \to {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork})\,, \quad \varepsilon_{\mathcal{I}}\colon \mathcal{I} \to ({}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{I})^{\pitchfork}.$$

These are the algebraic counterparts of the inclusions in (1.3). In the following, we will see that some familiar equalities between two classes of maps are replaced by functors back and forth

between two categories over $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$, for which we now introduce some notation. Given $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ and $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, we write

$$\mathcal{I} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{J} \tag{4.2}$$

to mean that there are functors $F\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{J}$ and $G\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{I}$ over $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$.

The rest of this section is devoted to establishing some facts regarding categories of orthogonal maps, describing the interplay between orthogonality functors and retract closure, slicing, adjunctions, Leibniz adjunctions, and Kan extensions. Most of these facts are expected generalizations of well-known statements for classes of weakly orthogonal classes in the standard setting. They are probably known to experts, but we include them since they are used in the remainder of the paper and we could not find them in the literature. We omit most proofs, which are straightforward. Given a functor $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, we define its *retract closure* $\overline{u}\colon \overline{\mathcal{I}} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ as follows. An object of $\overline{\mathcal{I}}$ is a tuple (i, e, σ, τ) consisting of an object $i \in \mathcal{I}$, an object $e \in \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, and maps $\sigma\colon e \to u_i$ $\rho\colon u_i \to e$ in $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ which exhibit e as a retract of u_i in $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$, i.e. such that



A map $(f, \kappa)\colon (i, e, \sigma, \tau) \to (i', e', \sigma', \tau')$ in $\overline{\mathcal{I}}$ consists of a map $f\colon i \to i'$ in $\mathcal{I}$ and a map $\kappa\colon e \to e'$ in $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ such that the following diagram in $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ commutes:



The functor $\overline{u}\colon \overline{\mathcal{I}} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ is then defined on objects by letting $\overline{u}(i, e, \sigma, \tau) =_{\text{def}} e$, and on maps by letting $\overline{u}(f, \kappa) =_{\text{def}} \kappa$. The operation of retract closure gives a monad in an evident way. The next proposition uses the notation introduced in (4.2).

PROPOSITION 4.2. *For every $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, we have pairs of functors as follows*

$$(\overline{\mathcal{I}})^{\pitchfork} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}\,, \quad (\overline{\overline{\mathcal{I}}})^{\pitchfork} \leftrightarrow \overline{\mathcal{I}}^{\pitchfork}\,, \quad {}^{\pitchfork}(\overline{\mathcal{I}}) \leftrightarrow {}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{I}\,, \quad {}^{\pitchfork}(\overline{\overline{\mathcal{I}}}) \leftrightarrow {}^{\pitchfork}\overline{\mathcal{I}}$$

over $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$. □

Given $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ and $X \in \mathcal{E}$, we define the *slice category* $\mathcal{I}_{/X}$ and functor $u_{/X}\colon \mathcal{I}_{/X} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/X}$ as follows. The category $\mathcal{I}_{/X}$ has as objects pairs consisting of an object $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and a commutative triangle of the form



The functor $u_{/X}\colon \mathcal{I}_{/X} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/X}$ sends such a pair to $u_i\colon A_i \to B_i$, viewed as a morphism in $\mathcal{E}_{/X}$. There is a also a *coslice* category over X, described dually, which we denote $u_{\backslash X}\colon \mathcal{I}_{\backslash X} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$. With these definitions in place, the commutation between slicing and weak orthogonality functors in the algebraic setting can be stated as follows.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Let $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ and $X \in \mathcal{E}$.*

(i) *The right orthogonality functor commutes with slicing, i.e. we have* $(\mathcal{I}_{/X})^{\pitchfork} = (\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork})_{/X}$ *as categories over* $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$.
(ii) *The left orthogonality functor commutes with coslicing, i.e. we have* ${}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}_{\setminus X}) = ({}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{I})_{\setminus X}$ *as categories over* $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$. □

In contrast to the right orthogonality functor, the left orthogonality functor does not commute with slicing in general. However, it does under certain assumptions, as described in Proposition 4.4 below.

PROPOSITION 4.4. *Let* $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ *and assume that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I} & \xrightarrow{u} & \mathcal{E}^{\to} \\ & {\scriptstyle \mathrm{cod}_{\mathcal{E}} \circ u} \searrow \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle \mathrm{cod}_{\mathcal{E}}} & \\ & \mathcal{E} & \end{array}$$

is a morphism of Grothendieck fibrations. Then the left orthogonality functor commutes with slicing on u, *i.e. for* $X \in \mathcal{E}$ *we have* ${}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}_{/X}) = ({}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{I})_{/X}$.

PROOF. First note that the composite $\mathrm{cod}_{\mathcal{E}_{/X}} \circ u_{/X}$ is also a Grothendieck fibration. When constructing the category of left maps for $\mathcal{I}$ or $\mathcal{I}_{/X}$, an application of base change and naturality of diagonal fillers shows that it is sufficient to consider lifting problems with the bottom arrow an identity. But for such lifting problems the order of slicing makes no difference. □

COROLLARY 4.5.
(i) *The monad* ${}^{\pitchfork}((-)^{\pitchfork})$ *commutes with slicing.*
(ii) *The monad* $({}^{\pitchfork}(-))^{\pitchfork}$ *commutes with coslicing.*

PROOF. Use Proposition 4.3 and note, for the first statement, that categories of right maps satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 4.4. The second statement follows dually. □

PROPOSITION 4.6. *The retract closure commutes with slicing and coslicing, in the sense that for every* $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ *we have* $\overline{\mathcal{I}_{/X}} = \overline{\mathcal{I}}_{/X}$ *as categories over* $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$. □

PROPOSITION 4.7. *Let* $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ *and* $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{F}^{\to}$. *For an adjunction* $F \dashv G$ *between* $\mathcal{E}$ *and* $\mathcal{F}$, *the following are equivalent:*

(i) *the functor* $F\colon \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{F}^{\to}$ *lifts to a functor* $\widetilde{F}\colon \mathcal{I} \to {}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{J}$ *making the following diagram commute:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{F}} & {}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{J} \\ {\scriptstyle u}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle {}^{\pitchfork}v} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to} & \xrightarrow[F]{} & \mathcal{F}^{\to}, \end{array}$$

(ii) *the functor* $G\colon \mathcal{F}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ *lifts to a functor* $\widetilde{G}\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$ *making the following diagram commute:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{J} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{G}} & \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork} \\ {\scriptstyle v}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle u^{\pitchfork}} \\ \mathcal{F}^{\to} & \xrightarrow[G]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. \end{array}$$

□

PROPOSITION 4.8. *Let $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ and $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{F}^{\to}$. Let $F_1 \dashv G_1$ and $F_2 \dashv G_2$ be adjunctions between $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ satisfying the equivalent conditions of Proposition 4.7. Let $m\colon F_1 \to F_2$ and $n\colon G_2 \to G_1$ be natural transformations forming mates. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) The natural transformation m lifts as follows:



(ii) The natural transformation n lifts as follows:



□

We generalize Proposition 4.7 to Leibniz adjunctions [32]. Let us fix bifunctors $F\colon \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{F}$ and $G\colon \mathcal{K}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{E}$ related pointwise, for $k \in \mathcal{K}$, by an adjunction:

$$\mathcal{E} \underset{G(k,-)}{\overset{F(k,-)}{\underset{\longleftarrow}{\overset{\longrightarrow}{\bot}}}} \mathcal{F}.$$

Let $\widehat{F}\colon \mathcal{K}^{\to} \times \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{F}^{\to}$ and $\widehat{G}\colon (\mathcal{K}^{\mathrm{op}})^{\to} \times \mathcal{F}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ denote the Leibniz constructions for F and G^{op}, using pullback instead of pushout for $\widehat{G}$. Here and below we assume that the categories under consideration have sufficient structure to carry out the relevant Leibniz constructions.

PROPOSITION 4.9. *Let $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{F}^{\to}$ be functors. Then the following are equivalent for $h\colon X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{K}$:*

(i) liftings $F'\colon \mathcal{I} \to {}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{J}$ of $\widehat{F}(h,-)\colon \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{F}^{\to}$ making the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I} & \xrightarrow{F'} & {}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{J} \\ {\scriptstyle u}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle {}^{\pitchfork}v} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to} & \xrightarrow[\widehat{F}(h,-)]{} & \mathcal{F}^{\to}, \end{array}$$

(ii) liftings $G'\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$ of $\widehat{G}(h,-)\colon \mathcal{F}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ making the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{J} & \xrightarrow{G'} & \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork} \\ {\scriptstyle v}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle u^{\pitchfork}} \\ \mathcal{F}^{\to} & \xrightarrow[\widehat{G}(h,-)]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. \end{array}$$

□

REMARK 4.10. We will apply Proposition 4.9 in Section 6 as follows. We will have categories $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$, and take $\mathcal{K}$ to be the category of adjunctions $U \dashv V$ with $U\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{F}$ and $V\colon \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{E}$, with morphisms from $U_1 \dashv V_1$ to $U_2 \dashv V_2$ given by natural transformations $u\colon U_1 \to U_2$ and $v\colon V_2 \to V_1$ forming mates. We can then take $F\colon \mathcal{K} \times \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{F}$ and $G\colon \mathcal{K}^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{E}$ to be the application of left and right adjoint, respectively.

Next, we establish some facts about the interaction between orthogonality functors and Kan extensions along fully faithful functors.

PROPOSITION 4.11. *Let $F\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{J}$ be a fully faithful functor.*

(i) Assume that the pointwise left Kan extension of $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ along F exists:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{J} \\ & {\scriptstyle u}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Lan}_F\, u} & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. & \end{array}$$

Then the functor $F^{\pitchfork}\colon \mathcal{J}^{\pitchfork} \to \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$, fitting in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork} & \xleftarrow{F^{\pitchfork}} & \mathcal{J}^{\pitchfork} \\ & {\scriptstyle u^{\pitchfork}}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle (\mathrm{Lan}_F\, u)^{\pitchfork}} & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}, & \end{array}$$

is an isomorphism.

(ii) Assume that the pointwise right Kan extension of $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ along F exists:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{J} \\ & {\scriptstyle u}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Ran}_F\, u} & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. & \end{array}$$

Then the functor ${}^{\pitchfork}F\colon {}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{J} \to {}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{I}$, fitting in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{I} & \xleftarrow{{}^{\pitchfork}F} & {}^{\pitchfork}\mathcal{J} \\ & {\scriptstyle {}^{\pitchfork}u}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathrm{Ran}_F\, u)} & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}, & \end{array}$$

is an isomorphism. □

Finally, we prove two results in the special case that $\mathcal{E}$ is a presheaf category, say $\mathcal{E} = \mathrm{Psh}(\mathbb{C})$, for $\mathbb{C}$ a small category. We write $\mathrm{y}\colon \mathbb{C} \to \mathcal{E}$ for the Yoneda embedding. Recall from Section 1 that we write $\mathcal{E}^{\to}_{\mathrm{cart}}$ for the category of arrows and pullback squares in $\mathcal{E}$.

LEMMA 4.12. *Let $\mathcal{J}$ be a full subcategory of $\mathcal{E}^{\to}_{\mathrm{cart}}$ closed under base change to representables, i.e. closed under pullbacks along morphisms with domain a representable presheaf. Let $\mathcal{I}$ denote its restriction to arrows into representables.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J} \\ & \searrow \quad \swarrow & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to} & \end{array}$$

Then the inclusion $\mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ is the left Kan extension of $\mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ along $\mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{J}$.

PROOF. Since $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ is cocomplete, we can verify the claim using the colimit formula for left Kan extensions. All of the following will be functorial in an object $j\colon A \to B$ of $\mathcal{J}$. We consider the diagram in $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ indexed by pullback squares of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A' & \longrightarrow & A \\ {\scriptstyle i}\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle j} \\ \mathrm{y}(x) & \xrightarrow[b]{} & B \end{array}$$

with $i\colon A' \to \mathrm{y}(x)$ in $\mathcal{I}$ and valued i. Our goal is to show that its colimit is j. Using the assumption that $\mathcal{J}$ is closed under base change to representables, the given diagram can be described equivalently as the the diagram indexed by maps $b\colon \mathrm{y}(x) \to B$ and valued $b^*(j)$. The claim can then be restated as $\mathrm{colim}_{b\colon \mathrm{y}(x)\to B}\, b^*(j) \cong j$, which holds since pullback commutes with colimits in presheaf categories, and $\mathrm{colim}_{b\colon \mathrm{y}(x)\to B}\, \mathrm{y}(x) \cong B$. □

PROPOSITION 4.13. *Let $\mathcal{J}$ be a full subcategory of $\mathcal{E}^{\to}_{\mathrm{cart}}$ closed under base change to representables. Let $\mathcal{I}$ denote its restriction to arrows into representables,*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J} \\ & \searrow \quad \swarrow & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. & \end{array}$$

Then $\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork} = \mathcal{J}^{\pitchfork}$.

PROOF. The result follows by combining part (i) of Proposition 4.11 and Lemma 4.12. □

5. The functorial Frobenius condition

Recall from [16, 19] that an *algebraic weak factorization* system (L, R) on a category $\mathcal{E}$ consist of a pair of functors $\mathsf{L}, \mathsf{R}\colon \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ providing factorizations $f = \mathsf{R}f \circ \mathsf{L}f$ functorially in $f \in \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ and an extension of the evident structure of (co)pointed endofunctors of L and R to that of a (co)monad, such that the canonical natural transformation $\mathsf{LR} \to \mathsf{RL}$ is a distributive law. We write L-Map and R-Map for the categories of (co)monad algebras and L-map and R-map for the categories of (co)pointed endofunctor (co)algebras over L and R, respectively. These come equipped with forgetful functors into $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ and fulfill

$$\mathsf{L}\text{-}\mathsf{map} = {}^{\pitchfork}\mathsf{R}\text{-}\mathsf{Map}\,, \quad \mathsf{R}\text{-}\mathsf{map} = \mathsf{L}\text{-}\mathsf{Map}^{\pitchfork}\,.$$

The awfs (L, R) has an underlying ordinary wfs, in which the left (right) class consists of the maps that admit the structure making them into an element of L-map (of R-map, respectively). Recall also that an awfs (L, R) is said to be *algebraically-free* on $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ if $\mathsf{R}\text{-}\mathsf{Map} = \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$. By Garner's small object argument [16], every $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ with $\mathcal{I}$ small determines an awfs (L, R) that is algebraically-free on $\mathcal{I}$. We call such an awfs *cofibrantly generated*.

We now state the analogue for an awfs of the Frobenius condition for a wfs. This condition, called the functorial Frobenius condition, was stated for a cloven wfs in [3], which is slightly a more general notion than that of an awfs. Let us fix some notation. For a category $\mathcal{E}$, we write $\mathcal{E}^{\to} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ for the pullback of $\mathrm{cod}\colon \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}$ with itself. This is the category of cospans in $\mathcal{E}$, i.e. pairs of arrows with common codomain. Pullback gives a functor $P\colon \mathcal{E}^{\to} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ sending a cospan (g, h) to $h^*(g)$.

DEFINITION 5.1. An awfs (L, R) satisfies the *functorial Frobenius condition* if pullback along R-map preserves L-map, in the sense of a lift $\tilde{P}$ of P, as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{L}\text{-map} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathsf{R}\text{-map} & \overset{\tilde{P}}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathsf{L}\text{-map} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}^{\to} & \xrightarrow[P]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. \end{array}$$

In this section we obtain an analogue of Proposition 1.4 for awfs's, i.e. a necessary and sufficient condition for an algebraically-free awfs to satisfy the functorial Frobenius condition. In the next section, we apply this characterization to prove a functorial Frobenius property for the awfs having uniform fibrations as right maps. In order to prove the desired characterization, it is convenient to work with a variant of the functorial Frobenius condition, which we introduce in Definition 5.2 below.

For this, we introduce some notation. Given $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, we write $\mathcal{I}_{/\mathcal{E}}$ for the category with objects given by an object $X \in \mathcal{E}$ and a map $u_i\colon A_i \to B_i$ in $\mathcal{E}_{/X}$. We write $s\colon \mathcal{I}_{/\mathcal{E}} \to \mathcal{E}$ for the first projection. Then, for $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, we can form a pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_{/\mathcal{E}} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{J} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{J} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle v} \\ \mathcal{I}_{/\mathcal{E}} & \xrightarrow[s]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. \end{array}$$

When u is the identity on $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$ and v is the codomain functor $\mathrm{cod}\colon \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}$, we obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E}_{/\mathcal{E}} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}^{\to} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E} \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{cod}} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/\mathcal{E}} & \xrightarrow[s]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. \end{array}$$

Pullback gives a functor $Q\colon \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/\mathcal{E}} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/\mathcal{E}}$ sending (f, h) to $h^*(f)$.

DEFINITION 5.2. Let $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $w\colon \mathcal{K} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ be categories of arrows. We say that $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K})$ satisfies the *generalized functorial Frobenius condition* if pullback along $\mathcal{J}$-maps sends $\mathcal{I}$-maps to $\mathcal{K}$-maps, i.e. the functor Q admits a lift $\tilde{Q}$ as below:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_{/\mathcal{E}} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{J} & \overset{\tilde{Q}}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathcal{K}_{/\mathcal{E}} \\ {\scriptstyle u_{/\mathcal{E}} \times_{\mathcal{E}} v}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w_{/\mathcal{E}}} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/\mathcal{E}} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}^{\to} & \xrightarrow[Q]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/\mathcal{E}}. \end{array} \tag{5.1}$$

The next proposition shows in what sense the generalized functorial Frobenius condition is functorial in its parameters.

PROPOSITION 5.3. *Consider categories $u_t\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $v_t\colon \mathcal{I}' \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $w\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ of arrows, for $t \in \{1\,,2\}$, related as follows:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_2 & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{I}_1 \\ & {\scriptstyle u_2}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle u_1} & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}, & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{J}_2 & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{J}_1 \\ & {\scriptstyle v_2}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle v_1} & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}, & \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{K}_1 & \xrightarrow{H} & \mathcal{K}_2 \\ & {\scriptstyle w_1}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle w_2} & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. & \end{array}$$

If $(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{J}_1, \mathcal{K}_1)$ satisfies the generalized functorial Frobenius condition, then so does $(\mathcal{I}_2, \mathcal{J}_2, \mathcal{K}_2)$. □

Next, we show that the generalized functorial Frobenius condition can be simplified under some assumptions.

PROPOSITION 5.4. *Let $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $w\colon \mathcal{K} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ be categories of arrows such that*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{J} & \xrightarrow{v} & \mathcal{E}^{\to} \\ & {\scriptstyle \mathrm{cod}_{\mathcal{E}} \circ v}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{cod}_{\mathcal{E}}} & \\ & \mathcal{E} & \end{array} \tag{5.2}$$

is a morphism of Grothendieck fibrations. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) the triple $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K})$ satisfies the generalized functorial Frobenius condition,

(ii) there is a lift $\tilde{P}$ as below:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{J} & \overset{\tilde{P}}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathcal{K} \\ {\scriptstyle u \times_{\mathcal{E}} v}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle w} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}^{\to} & \xrightarrow[P]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. \end{array} \tag{5.3}$$

PROOF. We will show that giving lifts $\tilde{Q}$ and $\tilde{P}$ as in (5.1) and (5.3), respectively, is equivalent. The situation (5.1) a priori represents a more general scenario: we are pulling back an arrow $u_i\colon A \to B$ with $i \in \mathcal{I}$ over an object Y along a map $v_j\colon X \to Y$ with $j \in \mathcal{J}$. In contrast, in (5.3) we restrict to the case that the map $B \to Y$ is the identity. It follows that any lift $\tilde{Q}$ induces a lift $\tilde{P}$. However, under the stated assumption, the lift $\tilde{Q}$ can be reconstructed from the lift $\tilde{P}$ by first pulling back v_j along $B \to Y$ to a map $v_{j'}\colon B \to D$ with $j' \to j$ a map in $\mathcal{J}$ in the above situation and then setting $\tilde{Q}(i,j) =_{\mathrm{def}} \tilde{P}(i,j')$. □

We can now restate the functorial Frobenius condition of Definition 5.1 equivalently in terms of the generalized functorial Frobenius condition of Definition 5.2.

PROPOSITION 5.5. *Let (L, R) be an awfs on $\mathcal{E}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) (L, R) satisfies the functorial Frobenius condition,

(ii) $(\mathsf{L}\text{-map}, \mathsf{R}\text{-map}, {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathsf{L}\text{-map}^{\pitchfork}))$ satisfies the generalized functorial Frobenius condition.

PROOF. Recall that $\mathsf{L}\text{-map} = {}^{\pitchfork}\mathsf{R}\text{-Map}$ is a category of left maps. We observe that both (i) and (ii) are equivalent to $(\mathsf{L}\text{-map}, \mathsf{R}\text{-map}, \mathsf{L}\text{-map})$ satisfying the generalized functorial Frobenius condition. For the equivalence with (i), use Proposition 5.4. For the equivalence with (ii), use Proposition 5.3, noting that $\mathsf{L}\text{-map} \leftrightarrow {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathsf{L}\text{-map}^{\pitchfork})$ over $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$, using the adjunction (4.1). □

The benefit of the reformulation of the functorial Frobenius condition as a uniform Frobenius condition is that the latter admits an equivalent rephrasing in terms of pushforward, rather than

pullback, functors. This rephrasing, which does not seem directly possible for the functorial Frobenius condition, will be essential to our characterization of algebraically-free awfs's satisfying the functorial Frobenius condition. As a first step towards the pushforward formulation, we decompose the uniform Frobenius condition into an object part and a morphism part. For this, recall that, for an arrow $f\colon X \to Y$, we have an adjunction $f_! \dashv f^*$ between composition and pullback. Given a functor $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, it is immediate to check that the left composition functor lifts as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_{/X} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{f_!}} & \mathcal{I}_{/Y} \\ {\scriptstyle u_{/X}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle u_{/Y}} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/X} & \xrightarrow[f_!]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/Y}. \end{array}$$

By Proposition 4.7, the pullback functor $f^*\colon \mathcal{E}_{/Y} \to \mathcal{E}_{/X}$ then lifts to slices of the right orthogonality categories,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}}_{/Y} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{f^*}} & {\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}}_{/X} \\ {\scriptstyle {u^{\pitchfork}}_{/Y}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle {u^{\pitchfork}}_{/X}} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/Y} & \xrightarrow[f^*]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/X}. \end{array}$$

Proposition 5.6. *Let $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $w\colon \mathcal{K} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$. Then $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork}))$ satisfies the generalized functorial Frobenius property if and only if the following hold:*

(i) for every $j \in \mathcal{J}$, pullback along $v_j\colon C_j \to D_j$ lifts to a functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_{/Y} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{v_j^*}} & {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork})_{/C_j} \\ {\scriptstyle u_{/D_j}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle {}^{\pitchfork}(w^{\pitchfork})_{/C_j}} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/D_j} & \xrightarrow[v_j^*]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/C_j}. \end{array}$$

(ii) for every $\tau\colon j \to k$ in $\mathcal{J}$, the square $v_\tau\colon v_j \to v_k$ in

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_j & \xrightarrow{v_j} & D_j \\ {\scriptstyle s}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle t} \\ C_k & \xrightarrow[v_k]{} & D_k, \end{array} \tag{5.4}$$

is such that the canonical natural transformation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/D_j} & \xrightarrow{v_j^*} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/C_j} \\ {\scriptstyle t_!}\downarrow & \Downarrow \phi & \downarrow{\scriptstyle s_!} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/D_k} & \xrightarrow[v_k^*]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/C_k} \end{array}$$

lifts to a natural transformation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{I}_{/D_j} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{v_j^*}} & {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork})_{/C_j} \\ {\scriptstyle \widetilde{t_!}}\downarrow & \Downarrow \tilde{\phi} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle s_!} \\ \mathcal{I}_{/D_k} & \xrightarrow[\widetilde{v_k^*}]{} & {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork})_{/C_k}. \end{array}$$

PROOF. We consider the lift $\widetilde{Q}$ of Q in the generalized functorial Frobenius condition (5.1) for $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork}))$. Since the functor ${}^{\pitchfork}(w^{\pitchfork})\colon {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{W}^{\pitchfork}) \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ is faithful, the lift $\widetilde{Q}$ consists just of a lift of the action of Q on objects that is coherent with respect to the action of Q on morphisms, in the sense that the action of Q on morphisms determines uniquely the action of $\widetilde{Q}$ on morphisms. Coherence in morphisms in $\mathcal{I}_{/\mathcal{E}} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{J}$ of the action on objects of $\widetilde{Q}$ separates into two parts:

(1) coherence in morphisms in $\mathcal{I}_{/D_j}$ for fixed $v_j\colon C_j \to D_j$ with $j \in \mathcal{J}$,
(2) coherence in morphisms in $\mathcal{J}$.

The action of $\widetilde{Q}$ on objects together with coherence (1) constitutes part (i). Coherence (2) constitutes part (ii). □

The statement of Proposition 5.6 makes it clear that the generalized functorial Frobenius condition requires the specification of additional structure, rather than the mere satisfaction of a property. Explicitly, part (i) requires that $v_j^*(u_i)\colon v_j^* X_i \to v_j^* Y_i$ is equipped with the structure of a left $\mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork}$-map for $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $u_i\colon X_i \to Y_i$ over D_j such that morphisms in $\mathcal{I}_{/D_j}$ induce morphisms of left $\mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork}$-maps. However, at the level of squares, the condition in part (ii) of Proposition 5.6 is just a property, not additional structure. Explicitly, it requires the components of the natural transformation ϕ to be morphisms of left $\mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork}$-maps. Also note that if the commutative square (5.4) is a pullback, then the canonical natural transformation ϕ is an isomorphism by the usual Beck-Chevalley condition, and so is $\tilde{\phi}$ since ${}^{\pitchfork}(u^{\pitchfork})$ reflects isomorphisms.

Proposition 5.6 has an immediate dual, expressed in terms of pushforward rather than pullback, which we state next.

PROPOSITION 5.7. *Let $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $w\colon \mathcal{K} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$. Then $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork}))$ satisfies the generalized Frobenius property if and only if the following hold:*

(i) for every $j \in \mathcal{J}$, pushforward along $v_j\colon C_j \to D_j$ lifts to a functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {\mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork}}_{/C_j} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{(v_j)_*}} & {\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}}_{/D_j} \\ {\scriptstyle {w^{\pitchfork}}_{/C_j}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle {u^{\pitchfork}}_{/D_j}} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/C_j} & \xrightarrow[(v_j)_*]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/D_j}. \end{array}$$

(ii) for every $\tau\colon j \to k$, the square $v_\tau\colon v_j \to v_k$, as in (5.4)*, is such that the canonical natural transformation*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/C_k} & \xrightarrow{(v_k)_*} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/D_k} \\ {\scriptstyle s^*}\downarrow & \Downarrow \psi & \downarrow{\scriptstyle t^*} \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/C_j} & \xrightarrow[(v_j)_*]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/D_j} \end{array}$$

lifts to a natural transformation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork}{}_{/C_k} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{(v_k)_*}} & \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}{}_{/D_k} \\ {\scriptstyle \widetilde{s^*}}\downarrow & \Downarrow \tilde{\psi} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{t^*}} \\ \mathcal{K}^{\pitchfork}{}_{/C_j} & \xrightarrow[\widetilde{(v_j)_*}]{} & \mathcal{I}'^{\pitchfork}{}_{/D_j}. \end{array}$$

PROOF. For (i), apply Proposition 4.7 to the adjunction $v_j^* \dashv (v_j)_*$ with $u = u_{/D_j}$ and $v = w^{\pitchfork}{}_{/C_j}$, using Proposition 4.4 to permute slicing and the left orthogonality functor. For (ii), apply Proposition 4.8 to the adjunctions $s_! v_j^* \dashv (v_j)_* s^*$ and $v_k^* t_! \dashv t^* (v_k)_*$ recalling that ϕ and ψ are mates. □

PROPOSITION 5.8. *Let $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ and $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}))$ satisfies the generalized functorial Frobenius condition.

(ii) $({}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}), \mathcal{J}, {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}))$ satisfies the generalized functorial Frobenius condition.

PROOF. Using Proposition 5.3 and the unit $\mathcal{I} \to {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork})$ of the adjunction (4.1), we see that statement (ii) implies statement (i). For the converse direction, we use the characterizations of statements (i) and (ii) provided by Proposition 5.7. The lift of pushforward for (i) can be composed with the counit $\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork} \to ({}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}))^{\pitchfork}$ of the adjunction (4.1) to induce a lift of pushforward for (ii). □

We can finally give the desired characterization of the functorial Frobenius condition for an algebraically-free awfs.

THEOREM 5.9. *Let (L, R) be an awfs algebraically-free on $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) (L, R) satisfies the functorial Frobenius condition,

(ii) $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}, {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork})) = (\mathcal{I}, \mathsf{R}\text{-}\mathsf{Map}, \mathsf{L}\text{-}\mathsf{map})$ satisfies the generalized functorial Frobenius condition.

PROOF. Using Proposition 4.2 and the adjunction (4.1), we have $\overline{\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$, hence $\mathsf{R}\text{-}\mathsf{Map} \leftrightarrow \overline{\mathsf{R}\text{-}\mathsf{Map}}$. Note that $\overline{\mathsf{R}\text{-}\mathsf{Map}} \leftrightarrow \mathsf{R}\text{-}\mathsf{map}$ (this is the case for (co)pointed endofunctor and (co)monad algebras over any (co)monad). It follows that $\mathsf{R}\text{-}\mathsf{Map} \leftrightarrow \mathsf{R}\text{-}\mathsf{map}$.

With this, the functorial Frobenius condition for (L, R) can be stated equivalently as the existence of a lift

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}) \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork} & \dashrightarrow & {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}^{\to} & \xrightarrow[P']{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. \end{array} \tag{5.5}$$

Using Proposition 5.4, this corresponds to the generalized functorial Frobenius condition for $({}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}), \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}, {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}))$. By Proposition 5.8, this is equivalent to the generalized functorial Frobenius condition for $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}, {}^{\pitchfork}(\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}))$. □

We conclude the section with a result needed in Section 7.

PROPOSITION 5.10. *Let $u_k\colon \mathcal{I}_k \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, $w_k\colon \mathcal{K}_k \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ for $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and $v\colon \mathcal{J} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$. If $(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K}_1,)$ and $(\mathcal{I}_2, \mathcal{J}_2, \mathcal{K}_2)$ satisfy the generalized functorial Frobenius property, then so do*

$$(\mathcal{I}_1 \times_{\mathcal{E}^{\to}} \mathcal{I}_2, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K}_1 \times_{\mathcal{E}^{\to}} \mathcal{K}_2), \quad (\mathcal{I}_1 +_{\mathcal{E}^{\to}} \mathcal{I}_2, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{K}_1 +_{\mathcal{E}^{\to}} \mathcal{K}_2).$$

PROOF. This follows easily from Proposition 5.3 using the universal property of products and coproducts in the category $\mathbf{CAT}_{/\mathcal{E}^{\to}}$. □

This concludes our work on orthogonality functors and the functorial Frobenius condition in general. In Section 6 and Section 7, we develop the algebraic counterpart of the material in Section 2 and Section 3.

6. Uniform fibrations

This section is devoted to introducing the notion of a uniform fibration, which is the algebraic counterpart of the notion of a fibration introduced in Definition 2.3. For this, we first introduce suitable awfs's, in complete analogy with the way we defined suitable wfs's in Definition 2.1. When introducing and discussing a suitable awfs, we use the notation $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{t}})$ and let

$$\mathsf{Cof} =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathsf{C}\text{-}\mathsf{map}\,, \quad \mathsf{TrivFib} =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{t}}\text{-}\mathsf{map}$$

We then refer to objects in Cof as *uniform cofibrations* and objects in $\mathsf{TrivFib}$ as *uniform trivial fibrations*. Again, we hope that this helps to convey some of the basic intuition motivating our development.

DEFINITION 6.1. An awfs $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{t}})$ is said to be *suitable* if the following conditions hold.

(S1) $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{t}})$ is cofibrantly generated.

(S2) The functor $\bot\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ mapping $X \in \mathcal{E}$ to $\bot_X\colon 0_{\mathcal{E}} \to X$ factors through Cof, as in the diagram



(S3) Cof is closed under pullback, in the sense that the pullback functor Q of Section 5 lifts as follows:



(S4) Cof is closed under Leibniz product with endpoint inclusions, in the sense that the Leibniz product functor lifts as follows:



The main difference between the notion of a suitable wfs (Definition 2.1) and that of a suitable awfs (Definition 6.1) is that the conditions in the former express closure of the class of left maps under the action of certain functions, while the conditions in the latter express closure of the category of left maps under the action of certain functors.

EXAMPLE 6.2. As we will see in Section 8, the categories **SSet** and **CSet** admit suitable awfs's $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{t}})$ that are algebraically-free on the categories $\mathcal{M}$ of all monomorphisms and pullback

squares, i.e. such that $\mathsf{TrivFib} = \mathcal{M}^{\pitchfork}$. The right maps of these awfs's are a natural algebraic counterpart of trivial Kan fibrations and so we call them *uniform trivial Kan fibrations*. Similarly, we will see that the category **CSet** also admits a suitable awfs $(\mathsf{C}', \mathsf{F_t}')$ algebraically-free on the category $\mathcal{M}'$ of monomorphisms classified by the face lattice Φ of [11] and pullback squares (see Example 2.5).

Let us now fix a suitable awfs $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F_t})$. We need some notation. For $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ and $k \in \{0\,,1\}$, we define a functor $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ by letting

$$(\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} u)_i =_{\mathrm{def}} \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} u_i =_{\mathrm{def}} \widehat{\mathrm{ev}}(\delta^k, u_i)\,.$$

We adopt similar conventions for other natural transformations (or maps of such) written using the tensor notation. Now let $\mathcal{I}_{\otimes} =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{I}$ and define $u_{\otimes}\colon \mathcal{I}_{\otimes} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ via the coproduct diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{I} & \xrightarrow{\iota_0} & \mathcal{I}_{\otimes} & \xleftarrow{\iota_1} & \mathcal{I} \\ & {\scriptstyle \delta^0 \hat{\otimes} u} \searrow & \downarrow{\scriptstyle u_{\otimes}} & \swarrow {\scriptstyle \delta^1 \hat{\otimes} u} & \\ & & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. & & \end{array} \tag{6.1}$$

In the special case of $u\colon \mathsf{L\text{-}Map} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, we write $c\colon \mathsf{Cyl} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ for $u_{\otimes}\colon \mathsf{L\text{-}Map}_{\otimes} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$. The image of this functor are maps of the form $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} i$, where $k \in \{0\,,1\}$ and i is a pointed coalgebra for L. These are the analogues of the open cylinder inclusions in (2.1). We use comonad algebras for L instead of uniform cofibrations here in order to ensure correctness of the following notion.

Definition 6.3.

(i) A *uniform fibration* is a right Cyl-map.
(ii) A *morphism of uniform fibrations* is a morphism of right Cyl-maps.

We write Fib for the category of uniform fibrations and their morphisms, which is given by $\mathsf{Fib} =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathsf{Cyl}^{\pitchfork}$. We now characterize uniform fibrations in terms of right Cof-maps. For this, we use the cocylinder structure on the right adjoint $\exp(I, -)$ to $I \otimes (-)$. We obtain a functor $\widehat{\exp}(\bar{\delta}^k, -)$, defined in terms of a pullback, dual to $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (-)$, which was defined in terms of a pushout, for $k \in \{0\,,1\}$. These form an adjunction as follows:

$$\mathcal{E}^{\to} \underset{\widehat{\exp}(\bar{\delta}^k, -)}{\overset{\delta^k \hat{\otimes} (-)}{\underset{\longleftarrow}{\overset{\longrightarrow}{\bot}}}} \mathcal{E}^{\to}.$$

The desired characterization of uniform fibration, stated in the next proposition, now follows from the general results in Section 4.

Proposition 6.4. *For a map $p\colon X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{E}$, the following are equivalent:*

(i) uniform fibration structures on p,
(ii) uniform trivial fibration structures on $\widehat{\exp}(\bar{\delta}^0, p)$ and $\widehat{\exp}(\bar{\delta}^1, p)$.

Proof. First recall that the right orthogonality functor is contravariant and part of the adjunction (4.1), hence sends coproducts to products of categories over $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$. The remainder of the claim follows from Proposition 4.9, as applied in Remark 4.10, and the discussion above. □

We show that uniform fibrations are the right maps of an awfs, using Garner's small object argument [16] (see also [7, Proposition 16]). For this, it is sufficient to establish that uniform fibrations can be defined equivalently by uniform right orthogonality with respect to a small category over $\mathcal{E}$.

THEOREM 6.5. *The category $\mathcal{E}$ admits an awfs $(\mathsf{C_t}, \mathsf{F})$ such that the category of F-maps is the category of uniform fibrations, i.e.* $\mathsf{F}\text{-}\mathsf{map} = \mathsf{Fib}$.

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a small generating category for $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F_t})$, which exists since $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F_t})$ is suitable (condition (S1) of Definition 6.1), and consider $\mathcal{I}_\otimes$ and $u_\otimes$, defined as in (6.1). Recall that $\mathsf{L}\text{-}\mathsf{Map}^{\pitchfork} = \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$. Using preservation of coproducts by $(-)^{\pitchfork}$ and Proposition 4.9, we then also have $\mathsf{Fib} = (\mathsf{L}\text{-}\mathsf{Map}_\otimes)^{\pitchfork} = (\mathcal{I}_\otimes)^{\pitchfork}$. The claim now follows from the smallness of $\mathcal{I}_\otimes$, via Garner's small object argument. □

We let $\mathsf{TrivCof} =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathsf{C_t}\text{-}\mathsf{map}$ and refer to its elements as *uniform trivial cofibrations*.

EXAMPLE 6.6. If we start from the awfs's $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F_t})$ in **SSet** and **CSet** of Example 6.2 and apply Theorem 6.5, we obtain awfs's $(\mathsf{C_t}, \mathsf{F})$ whose right maps are algebraic counterparts of Kan fibrations, and hence will be called *uniform Kan fibrations*. If instead in the case of **CSet**, we start with the awfs $(\mathsf{C}', \mathsf{F_t}')$ of Example 6.2, we obtain an awfs $(\mathsf{C_t}', \mathsf{F}')$ whose right maps are exactly the uniform Kan fibrations considered in [11]. An application to a different version of cubical sets (not using connections) gives the awfs developed in [33].

7. The functorial Frobenius property for uniform fibrations

We now continue to consider the fixed suitable awfs $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F_t})$ and the induced awfs $(\mathsf{C_t}, \mathsf{F})$, in which the F-maps are exactly the uniform fibrations. Our aim in this section is to show that $(\mathsf{C_t}, \mathsf{F})$ satisfies the functorial Frobenius property.

For this, we follow a strategy analogous to the one we used in Section 3. We begin by organizing strong k-oriented homotopy equivalences into a category $\mathcal{S}_k$. Its objects are 4-tuples (f, g, ϕ, ψ) consisting of an arrow $f\colon A \to B$ together with data $g\colon B \to A$, $\phi\colon I \otimes A \to A$, $\psi\colon I \otimes B \to B$ making f into a strong k-oriented homotopy equivalence in the sense of Definition 3.1. A morphism $m\colon (f, g, \phi, \psi) \to (f', g', \phi', \psi')$ consists of maps $s\colon A \to A', t\colon B \to B'$ such that the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{s} & A' \\ {\scriptstyle f}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f'} \\ B & \xrightarrow[t]{} & B', \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{t} & B' \\ {\scriptstyle g}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g'} \\ A & \xrightarrow[s]{} & A', \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} I \otimes A & \xrightarrow{I \otimes s} & I \otimes A' \\ {\scriptstyle \phi}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi'} \\ A & \xrightarrow[s]{} & A', \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} I \otimes B & \xrightarrow{I \otimes t} & I \otimes B' \\ {\scriptstyle \psi}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi'} \\ B & \xrightarrow[t]{} & B'. \end{array}$$

There is an obvious first projection functor $p_k\colon \mathcal{S}_k \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$. Lemma 7.1 below extends the equivalence of Lemma 3.3 to an isomorphism of categories. In its statement, we refer to the maps $\theta^k \hat{\otimes} f\colon f \to \delta^k \hat{\otimes} f$ in (3.2).

LEMMA 7.1. *For $k \in \{0, 1\}$, the category $\mathcal{S}_k$ of strong k-oriented homotopy equivalences can be described isomorphically as the category of arrows $f \in \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ with a retraction ρ of $\theta^k \hat{\otimes} f$. In detail,*

(i) objects are pairs (f, ρ) consisting of $f \in \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ and a retraction ρ of $\theta^k \hat{\otimes} f$, as below:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} f & \xrightarrow{\theta^k \hat{\otimes} f} & \delta^k \hat{\otimes} f \\ & \searrow\!\!= & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho} \\ & & f, \end{array}$$

(ii) morphisms $\tau\colon (f,\rho) \to (f',\rho')$ *are maps* $\tau\colon f \to f'$ *such that the below diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f & \xrightarrow{\delta^k \hat{\otimes} \tau} & \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f' \\ {\scriptstyle\rho}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\rho'} \\ u_i & \xrightarrow[\tau]{} & u_{i'}. \end{array}$$

Proof. The object part of the correspondence is essentially Lemma 3.3. The morphism part is straightforward. □

Remark 7.2. As suggested by our notation, the maps $\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f\colon f \to \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f$ are really given as the action on objects of a functor $\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (-)\colon \mathrm{Id} \to \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (-)$ as follows. Let $\theta^k\colon \bot_{\mathrm{Id}} \to \delta^k \otimes (-)$ denote the arrow in $[\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}^{\to}] = [\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}]^{\to}$ given by the following square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \xrightarrow{\bot_{\mathrm{Id}}} & \mathrm{Id} \\ {\scriptstyle\bot_{\mathrm{Id}}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\delta^k\otimes(-)} \\ \mathrm{Id} & \xrightarrow[\delta^{1-k}\otimes(-)]{} & I. \end{array}$$

Writing $(-)\otimes(-)\colon [\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}] \times \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ as an infix shorthand for functor application, the Leibniz construction [32] induces a bifunctor $(-)\mathbin{\hat{\otimes}}(-)\colon [\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}]^{\to} \times \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ on the level of arrows. The desired functor is now precisely given by $\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (-)\colon \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to (\mathcal{E}^{\to})^{\to}$.

Remark 7.3. Recall from Remark 3.2 that the components of the endpoint inclusion $\delta^k \otimes (-)$ are a strong k-oriented homotopy equivalences. In fact, this is the action on objects of a factoring of $\delta^k \otimes (-)$ via $\mathcal{S}_k$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{S}_k \\ & \overset{\widetilde{\delta^k\otimes(-)}}{\nearrow} & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow[\delta^k\otimes(-)]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. \end{array}$$

The next lemma is the analogue of Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 7.4. *For* $k \in \{0\,,1\}$*, the functor* $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (-)\colon \mathcal{E}^{\to} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ *factors via* $\mathcal{S}_k$*, as follows,*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{S}_k \\ & \overset{\widetilde{\delta^k\hat{\otimes}(-)}}{\nearrow} & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to} & \xrightarrow[\delta^k\hat{\otimes}(-)]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. \end{array}$$

Proof. We use the description of $\mathcal{S}_k$ provided by Lemma 7.1. We use the notation of Remark 7.2, allowing us to write just δ^k for the natural transformation $\delta^k \otimes (-)$. Let $(-)\mathbin{\hat{\circ}}(-)$ denote the Leibniz construction of endofunctor composition $(-)\circ(-)$ on $[\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}]$. We assume some familiarity with the workings of the Leibniz construction as explained in [32].

Recall from Remark 7.3 that δ^k lifts through $\mathcal{S}_k \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, i.e. that

$$\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (\delta^k \otimes X)\colon \delta^k \otimes X \to \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (\delta^k \otimes X)$$

admits a retraction functorially in $X \in \mathcal{E}$. This amounts to a retraction of

$$\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\circ}} \delta^k\colon \delta^k \to \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\circ}} \delta^k.$$

Our goal, a lift of $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (-)$ through $\mathcal{S}_k \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, can be rephrased as

$$\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f) \colon \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f \to \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} (\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f)$$

admitting a retraction functorially in $f \in \mathcal{E}^{\to}$. By associativity of functor composition, implying associativity of the corresponding Leibniz constructions if the involved functors preserve pushouts, this is the same map as

$$(\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\circ}} \delta^k) \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f \colon (\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\circ}} \delta^k) \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f \to \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f.$$

But functors, in this case $m \mapsto m \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f$, preserve section-retraction pairs. □

The next lemma is the analogue of Lemma 3.5. Define $\mathcal{S} =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathcal{S}_0 + \mathcal{S}_1$.

Proposition 7.5.

(i) There is a functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Cyl} & \xrightarrow{\quad F \quad} & \mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}^{\to}} \mathcal{S} \\ & \searrow \quad \swarrow & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. & \end{array}$$

(ii) There is a functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}^{\to}} \mathcal{S} & \xrightarrow{\quad H \quad} & \mathsf{TrivCof} \\ & \searrow \quad \swarrow & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. & \end{array}$$

Proof. For (i), we first show that there is a functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Cof} & \xrightarrow{\quad M_k \quad} & \mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}^{\to}} \mathcal{S}_k \\ & {\scriptstyle \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} u} \searrow \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle \langle u, p_k \rangle} & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. & \end{array}$$

The map to the first factor is the identity; the map to the second factor is given by the assumption that Cof is closed under Leibniz product with the endpoint inclusions, which is part of the hypotheses of a suitable awfs. The claim in (i) then follows by using the map $\mathsf{L\text{-}Map} \to \mathsf{Cof}$ and combining the cases $k = 0$ and $k = 1$.

For (ii), we first fix $k \in \{0, 1\}$ and show that there is a functor

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}^{\to}} \mathcal{S}_k & \xrightarrow{\quad N_k \quad} & \overline{\mathsf{Cof}} \\ & {\scriptstyle \langle u, p_k \rangle} \searrow \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle \overline{\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} u}} & \\ & \mathcal{E}^{\to}. & \end{array} \tag{7.1}$$

We only describe the action of the functor N_k on an object (f, ρ), leaving the evident definition of the action on arrows to the reader. Recall that ρ is a retraction of $\theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f \colon f \to \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f$, exhibiting f as a retract of $\delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f$. Thus, we may define $N_k(f, \rho) =_{\mathrm{def}} (f, f, \theta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} f, \rho)$. Observe that this definition makes the diagram for N_k commute. The claim in (ii) now follows by combining the cases $k = 0$ and $k = 1$ and composing with a component of the unit of the monad ${}^{\pitchfork}((-)^{\pitchfork})$. Note that the retract closure in (7.1) vanishes because of Proposition 4.2. □

REMARK 7.6. We also have a pair of functors $(\mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}^\to} \mathcal{S})^\pitchfork \leftrightarrow \mathsf{Fib}$ relating uniform fibrations with right $(\mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}^\to} \mathcal{S})$-maps. This means that a map can be equipped with the structure of a uniform fibration if and only if it can be equipped with the structure of a right $(\mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}^\to} \mathcal{S})$-map. This is the analogue of the equality between sets in Remark 3.6. However, these functors do not in general form an equivalence.

We are now ready to show that the awfs in which the right maps are the uniform fibrations (constructed in Theorem 6.5) satisfies the functorial Frobenius property. For this, we use our characterisation of the functorial Frobenius property in algebraically-free awfs's stated in Theorem 5.9. As a step, we show that that strong homotopy equivalences and uniform fibrations satisfy the generalized functorial Frobenius condition, i.e. the algebraic analogue of Lemma 3.7.

LEMMA 7.7. *The triple* $(\mathcal{S}, \mathsf{Fib}, \mathcal{S})$ *satisfies the generalized functorial Frobenius condition.*

PROOF. The core of the argument is to obtain, for $k \in \{0\,, 1\}$, a lift $\tilde{P}$ in

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}_k \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathsf{Fib} & \overset{\tilde{P}}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathcal{S}_k \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{E}^\to \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}^\to & \xrightarrow[P]{} & \mathcal{E}^\to. \end{array} \tag{7.2}$$

where $P\colon \mathcal{E}^\to \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{E}^\to \to \mathcal{E}^\to$ be the pullback functor, sending a cospan (g, h) to $h^* g$. The goal then follows from Proposition 5.4 upon combining the cases $k = 0$ and $k = 1$ using Proposition 5.10.

So it remains to show how to obtain the lift in in (7.2). Its action on objects is described in the proof of Lemma 3.7. For the lift of the action on morphisms, suppose we are given a map $j \to j'$ in Fib forming a square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{v_j} & Y \\ {\scriptstyle s}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle t} \\ X' & \xrightarrow[v_{j'}]{} & Y' \end{array}$$

and a map $(g, \rho) \to (g', \rho')$ in $\mathcal{S}_k$ with $\tau\colon g \to g'$ forming a square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \longrightarrow & B' \\ {\scriptstyle g}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g'} \\ Y & \xrightarrow[t]{} & Y' \end{array}$$

such that τ commutes with the retractions ρ and ρ' as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} g & \xrightarrow{\rho} & g \\ {\scriptstyle \delta^k \hat{\otimes} \tau}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \tau} \\ \delta^k \mathbin{\hat{\otimes}} g' & \xrightarrow[\rho']{} & g'. \end{array}$$

Let $(\bar{g}, \bar{\rho})$ and $(\bar{g}', \bar{\rho}')$ denote the respective action of P on the objects (g, ρ, j) and (g', ρ', j') as constructed in the first part of the proof. Recall that this includes pullback squares $\sigma\colon \bar{g} \to g$ and $\sigma'\colon \bar{g}' \to g'$ with bottom side $v_j\colon X \to Y$ and $v_{j'}\colon X' \to Y'$, respectively, as in (3.5). The square $\tau\colon g \to g'$ pulls back to a square $\bar{\tau}\colon \bar{g} \to \bar{g}'$ with bottom side $v_{j'}$. We want to show that $\bar{\tau}$

in addition forms a morphism of strong k-oriented homotopy equivalences from $(\bar{g}, \bar{\rho})$ to $(\bar{g}', \bar{\rho}')$. For this, we have to verify commutativity of the following diagram:



Recall the construction of $\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{\rho}'$, omitting horizontal composite identities for readability:



Our goal is to show that the top right square commutes. Since that square commutes after composing it with the pullback square σ', it suffices to show that the square commutes when projected to codomains, again omitting horizontal composite identities:



But this follows from coherence of lifts in the following morphism of lifting problems:



Here, the left and right faces form morphisms in $\mathsf{TrivCof}$ and Fib, respectively, making the lifts cohere as needed. □

THEOREM 7.8. *The awfs* $(\mathsf{C}_\mathsf{t}, \mathsf{F})$ *satisfies the functorial Frobenius condition.*

PROOF. First, we show that $(\mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{S}, \mathsf{Fib}, \mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{S})$ satisfies the generalized functorial Frobenius condition. This follows from Proposition 5.10 since $(\mathsf{Cof}, \mathsf{Fib}, \mathsf{Cof})$ satisfies the generalized functorial Frobenius condition by hypothesis (S3) in the definition of a suitable awfs (Definition 6.1) and $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}, \mathsf{Fib})$ satisfies the generalized Frobenius condition by Lemma 7.7.

Let the awfs $(\mathsf{C}_\mathsf{t}, \mathsf{F})$ be algebraically free on $\mathcal{I}_\otimes$ as in the proof of Theorem 6.5. The generalized functorial Frobenius condition for $(\mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{S}_k, \mathsf{Fib}, \mathsf{Cof} \times_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{S}_k)$ implies the generalized functorial Frobenius condition for $(\mathcal{I}_\otimes, \mathsf{Fib}, \mathsf{TrivCof})$ using functoriality of generalized functorial Frobenius in the form of Proposition 5.3 with F essentially the functor in part (i) of Proposition 7.5 and H the functor in part (ii) of Proposition 7.5. This implies the functorial Frobenius condition by Theorem 5.9. □

As special cases, we obtain the pushforward versions of the Frobenius and Beck-Chevalley condition for uniform fibrations. First, pushforward lifts to slices of the category of uniform $\mathcal{I}$-fibrations.

COROLLARY 7.9.

(i) For every uniform fibration $p\colon X \to Y$*, pushforward along* p *lifts to a functor*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Fib}_{/X} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{p_*}} & \mathsf{Fib}_{/Y} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/X} & \xrightarrow[p_*]{} & \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{/Y}. \end{array}$$

(ii) For every map of uniform $\mathcal{I}$*-fibrations* $(s,t)\colon p \to q$ *, where* $p\colon X \to Y$ *and* $q\colon U \to V$*, the canonical natural transformation* $\psi\colon t^* q_* \to p_* s^*$ *lifts to a natural transformation*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathsf{Fib}_{/U} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{q_*}} & \mathsf{Fib}_{/V} \\ {\scriptstyle \widetilde{s^*}}\downarrow & \Downarrow \widetilde{\psi} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{t^*}} \\ \mathsf{Fib}_{/X} & \xrightarrow[\widetilde{p_*}]{} & \mathsf{Fib}_{/Y}. \end{array}$$

If $(s,t)\colon p \to q$ *forms a pullback square, then* $\widetilde{\psi}$ *is a natural isomorphism.*

PROOF. The claim follows from Theorem 7.8 using Theorem 5.9 and Proposition 5.7. □

EXAMPLE 7.10. The application of Corollary 7.9 in **SSet** and **CSet** shows that pushforward along a uniform Kan fibration preserves uniform Kan fibrations. Since exponentiation is a special case of pushforward, this result shows also that if X is a uniform Kan complexes (defined in the evident way) then Y^X is again a uniform Kan complex, for every Y. In fact, as usual, only the base needs to be assumed uniform Kan. This can be seen as follows. Let $p\colon X \to A$ be a uniform Kan fibration and $i\colon B \to Y$ be a monomorphism. Recall that $\mathcal{M} \times_{\mathcal{E}^\to} \mathcal{S}_k$ is closed under Leibniz product with i, for $k \in \{0\,, 1\}$, since it is true separately for $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{S}_k$. By Proposition 4.9, we have that $\widehat{\exp}(i,p)$ is again a uniform Kan fibration. The desired claim is then the special case $A = 1$ and $B = 0$.

8. Uniform fibrations in presheaf categories

The aim of this final section is to study in more detail the notion of a uniform fibration in the case when $\mathcal{E}$ is a presheaf category. Let us begin by fixing the setting in which we shall be working. First, let $\mathbb{C}$ be a small category and fix $\mathcal{E} =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathrm{Psh}(\mathbb{C})$. We write $\mathrm{y}\colon \mathbb{C} \to \mathcal{E}$ for the Yoneda embedding. We assume that the functorial cylinder $I \otimes (-)\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ satisfies not only our standing assumptions of having contractions and connections and of possessing a right adjoint (see Section 1), but also the following two conditions:

(C1) $I \otimes (-)\colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ preserves pullback squares,
(C2) the natural transformations $\delta^k \otimes (-)\colon \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{E}} \to I \otimes (-)$, for $k \in \{0\,,1\}$, are cartesian.

Secondly, we let $\mathcal{M}$ be a full subcategory of $\mathcal{E}^{\to}_{\mathrm{cart}}$ satisfying the following assumptions:

(M1) the elements of $\mathcal{M}$ are monomorphisms,
(M2) for every $X \in \mathcal{E}$, the unique map $\bot_X\colon 0 \to X$ is in $\mathcal{M}$,
(M3) the elements of $\mathcal{M}$ are closed under pullbacks,
(M4) the elements of $\mathcal{M}$ are closed under Leibniz product with the endpoint inclusions,
(M5) the category $\mathcal{M}$ has colimits and the inclusion $\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}_{\mathrm{cart}}$ preserves them.[2]

The next result not only provides us with a wide class of examples of suitable awfs's, but also shows that there are situations in which object-wise assertions, as in (M2)-(M4) above, can be strengthened to functoriality properties, as required to obtain a suitable weak awfs (Definition 6.1).

Theorem 8.1. *There exists a suitable awfs* $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{t}})$ *on* $\mathcal{E}$ *that is algebraically-free on* $\mathcal{M}$*, i.e. such that* $\mathsf{TrivFib} = \mathcal{M}^{\pitchfork}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the full subcategory of $\mathcal{M}$ spanned by maps with a representable presheaf as codomain. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is small, by Garner's small object argument [16] it generates a cofibrantly generated awfs $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{t}})$ with $\mathsf{TrivCof} = \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$. Furthermore, we have $\mathcal{M}^{\pitchfork} = \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$. This follows from Proposition 4.13 using that $\mathcal{M}$ is a full subcategory of $\mathcal{E}^{\to}_{\mathrm{cart}}$. Indeed, for a map $f\colon X \to Y$ in $\mathcal{E}$, to give a natural choice of fillers for all diagrams with an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{M}$ on the left is the same as to give a natural choice of fillers for only those diagrams which are the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ \mathrm{y}(x) & \longrightarrow & Y, \end{array}$$

where $\mathrm{y}(x)$ the Yoneda embedding of some $x \in \mathbb{C}$.

It remains to check that $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{t}})$ satisfies conditions (S2)-(S4) in Definition 6.1. These follow from the corresponding object-wise assumptions (M2)-(M4) via standard diagram-chasing arguments, which we omit. For condition (S4), the crucial property being used in that proof is that elements of $\mathcal{M}$, being monomorphisms in a topos, are adhesive maps [18]. □

Remark 8.2. Let us point out that the reduction to the lifting problems against maps in $\mathcal{M}$ to those with a representable codomain in the proof of Theorem 8.1 exploits the good behaviour of the right orthogonality functor with respect to colimits as described in Proposition 4.13, which is not available in the setting of ordinary wfs's.

[2]This assumption not used in the instantiation of our general results to this setting, but only for the separate Lemma 8.6 and Theorem 8.8.

EXAMPLE 8.3. Since assumptions (C1)-(C2) and (M1)-(M5) are fulfilled in both **SSet** and **CSet**, with $\mathcal{M}$ the category of all monomorphisms and pullback squares (with (M5) a consequence of the existence of a subobject classifier), Theorem 8.1 establishes the existence of the awfs $(\mathsf{C_t}, \mathsf{F})$ of Example 6.6. The assumptions are also satisfied if instead in **CSet** we choose for $\mathcal{M}$ the category of $\mathcal{M}'$ of Example 6.2 (with elements classified by the face lattice Φ of [11]), establishing the existence of the awfs $(\mathsf{C_t}', \mathsf{F}')$ of Example 6.6.

REMARK 8.4. We discuss how, in the case of **SSet** and **CSet**, the existence of the awfs's $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F_t})$, having uniform trivial Kan fibrations as right maps, and $(\mathsf{C_t}, \mathsf{F})$, having uniform Kan fibrations as right maps, and the Frobenius property for $(\mathsf{C_t}, \mathsf{F})$ can can be proved constructively, i.e. without using the law of excluded middle or the axiom of choice.

We begin by observing that Theorem 8.1 can be proved constructively in **SSet** and **CSet**. In order to see why this is the case, first note that in these examples every subobject of a representable is finitely presentable and that the functorial cylinder $I \otimes (-) \colon \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ preserves finitely presentable objects. Since subobjects of representables are finitely presentable, the values of the inclusion $u \colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ are finitely presentable objects of $\mathcal{E}^{\to}$. An inspection of the proof of [16, Theorem 4.4] shows that this suffices to construct the algebraically-free awfs $(\mathsf{C}, \mathsf{F_t})$ on $u \colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$, and in fact the sequence constructing the appropriate free monad converges after ω steps. Next, note that also Theorem 6.5 can be proved constructively for **SSet** and **CSet**, via a reasoning that is analogous to the one above, observing that also the values of $u_{\otimes} \colon \mathsf{Cyl} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ are finitely presentable by the assumption of the functorial cylinder and the fact that finitely presentable objects are closed under pushout. Finally, the general proof of Theorem 7.8 and Corollary 7.9, establishing the functorial Frobenius condition for $(\mathsf{C_t}, \mathsf{F})$ and its pushforward analogue, are constructive.

We have therefore obtained a constructive proof that pushforward along a uniform Kan fibration preserves uniform Kan fibrations in **SSet** and **CSet**. For **SSet**, this result is a constructive counterpart of the fact that pushforward along a Kan fibration preserves Kan fibrations, which cannot be proved constructively without changes to the definition of Kan fibration [6].

Finally, let us point out that if one adds the assumption that elements of $\mathcal{M}$ are *decidable* monomorphisms, then the argument above carries over without relying on the Power Set axiom to establish the smallness of $\mathcal{I}$.

The rest of this section is devoted to give a characterization of uniform trivial fibrations in terms of the partial map classifier, a result suggested to us by Thierry Coquand and André Joyal, and then use this characterization to relate non-algebraic and algebraic notions of (trivial) fibration. We begin with a simple lemma.

LEMMA 8.5. *For all* $X \in \mathcal{E}$, $\mathrm{id}_X \in \mathcal{M}$.

PROOF. The claim follows by inspection of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Id} \otimes X \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}_X}\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \delta^0 \hat{\otimes} \perp_X} \\ \mathrm{Id} \otimes X & \xrightarrow[\delta^0 \hat{\otimes} \perp_X]{} & I \otimes X. \end{array}$$

By conditions (M2) and (M4), the right map is in $\mathcal{M}$. By condition (C2), the square is a pullback. With condition (M3), the left map id_X is then in $\mathcal{M}$. □

Below, as usual, we write Ω for the subobject classifier of the topos $\mathcal{E}$ and $\top \colon 1 \to \Omega$ for its 'true' morphism.

LEMMA 8.6. *There exists a subobject $K \rightarrowtail \Omega$ and a factorization*



such that the map $1 \to K$ classifies maps in $\mathcal{M}$, in the sense that a map $i\colon A \to B$ is in $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if there exists a pullback



PROOF. For $x \in \mathbb{C}$, define $K(x)$ to be the set of subobjects of $\mathrm{y}(x)$ that are elements of $\mathcal{M}$. The factorisation of $\top\colon 1 \to \Omega$ through K follows since identities are contained in $\mathcal{M}$ by Lemma 8.5.

Any element $i\colon A \to B$ of $\mathcal{M}$ arises as base change of $1 \to K$ along a unique map $B \to K$, sending an element $b\colon \mathrm{y}(x) \to B$, for $x \in \mathbb{C}$, to the subobject of $\mathrm{y}(x)$ given by the base change of $i\colon A \to B$ along b, which is in $K(x)$ since i is in $\mathcal{M}$. For the converse, it suffices to show that $1 \to K$ is in $\mathcal{M}$, but this is equivalent to (M5). □

The axioms for the class $\mathcal{M}$ in (M1)-(M5) can then be rewritten in equivalent form as properties of the classifier K, see [29] for details. Observe that the factorization of $\top\colon 1 \to \Omega$ via K gives us a pullback diagram



(8.1)

Let us now fix $Y \in \mathcal{E}$ and work in the slice category $\mathcal{E}_{/Y}$. Let $t\colon Y \to K \times Y$ denote the classifier for $\mathcal{I}_{/Y}$. Let $\pi\colon K \times Y \to Y$ denote the map to the terminal object. The *$\mathcal{M}$-partial map classifier* P_Y relative to Y associated to $\mathcal{M}$ is the polynomial endofunctor, in the sense of [14], on $\mathcal{E}_{/Y}$ given by the data

$$Y \xleftarrow{\mathrm{id}_K} Y \xrightarrow{t} K \times Y \xrightarrow{\pi} Y$$

as $P_Y = \pi_! \circ t_*$ [23, A2.4]. Note that we have $t^* t_* = \mathrm{Id}$ since t is monic, giving rise to a pullback square



(8.2)

for every $X \in \mathcal{E}_{/Y}$.

THEOREM 8.7. *Giving the structure of a uniform trivial fibration on a map $f\colon X \to Y$ is equivalent to giving a diagonal filler for the diagram*



i.e. a retraction of η_X in $\mathcal{E}_{/Y}$.

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the full subcategory of $\mathcal{M}$ spanned by maps with a representable presheaf as codomain and recall from the proof of Theorem 8.1 that we have $\mathcal{M}^{\pitchfork} = \mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$. Let $u\colon \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{E}^{\to}$ denote the inclusion. Following the first step of Garner's algebraic small object argument, a lift of a map $f\colon X \to Y$ to an element of $\mathcal{I}^{\pitchfork}$ is given by a diagonal filler in the canonical square $(\mathrm{Lan}_u\, u)(f) \to f$. Developing the left Kan extension, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{Lan}_u\, u)(f) &= \mathrm{colim}_{i\in\mathcal{I}, u_i \to f}\, u_i \\ &= \mathrm{colim}_{\sigma : yC \to K\times Y,\ \mathcal{E}_{/Y}(t^*\sigma, X)}\, \sigma^* t \\ &= \mathrm{colim}_{\sigma : yC \to P_Y(X)}\, \sigma^* \eta_X \\ &= \eta_X\,.\end{aligned}$$

Here, the penultimate step uses the pullback square (8.2) and the last step uses the Yoneda lemma and preservation of colimits by pullback. □

THEOREM 8.8.

(i) A map can be equipped with the structure of a uniform trivial fibration if and only if it is a trivial fibration, i.e. it has the right lifting property with respect to the maps in $\mathcal{M}$.

(ii) A map can be equipped with the structure of a uniform trivial fibration if and only if it is a fibration, i.e. it has the right lifting property with respect to the open cylinder inclusions.

PROOF. For part (i), since $1 \to K$ is in $\mathcal{M}$, as proved in Lemma 8.6, then also η has components in $\mathcal{M}$ by (8.2). Part (ii) follows from part (i) and Proposition 6.4. □

EXAMPLE 8.9. Theorem 8.8 applies to **SSet** and **CSet**, showing that a map can be equipped with the structure of a (trivial) Kan fibration if and only if it is a (trivial) Kan fibration in the usual sense.

REMARK 8.10. Since Theorem 8.8 is proved constructively, it is natural to wonder whether it is possible to develop constructively our theory in the non-algebraic setting, at least for **SSet** or **CSet**. The key obstacle to this is that, while the special case of the algebraic result in Theorem 8.1 admits a constructive proof in **SSet** and **CSet**, as we explained in Remark 8.4, its non-algebraic counterpart does not seem to provable be constructively, even in the case when $\mathcal{M}$ consists of all monomorphisms (cf. Example 2.2 and Remark 8.2). And such a result is essential for the development since it provides the suitable (algebraic) wfs on which the definition of the functorial Frobenius property is based.

References

[1] S. Awodey. Notes on cubical models of type theory. Draft manuscript, March 2015.

[2] M. Batanin, D.-C. Cisinski, and M. Weber. Multitensor lifting and strictly unital higher category theory. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 28:804–856, 2013.

[3] B. van den Berg and R. Garner. Topological and simplicial models of identity types. *Transactions of the ACM on Computational Logic*, 13(1):3–44, 2012.

[4] J. Bergner and C. Rezk. Reedy categories and the Θ-construction. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 274(1):499–514, 2013.

[5] M. Bezem, T. Coquand, and S. Huber. A model of type theory in cubical sets. In Ralph Matthes and Aleksy Schubert, editors, *19th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs (TYPES 2013)*, volume 26, pages 107–128. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2014.

[6] M. Bezem, T. Coquand, and E. Parmann. Non-constructivity in Kan simplicial sets. In Thorsten Altenkirch, editor, *13th International Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications (TLCA 2015)*, volume 38, pages 92–106. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2015.

[7] J. Bourke and R. Garner. Algebraic weak factorisation systems I: accessible AWFS. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 220:108–147, 2016.

[8] A. K. Bousfield. Constructions of factorisation systems in categories. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 9:207–220, 1977.
[9] D.-C. Cisinski. Les préfaisceaux comme modèles des types d'homotopie. *Astérisque*, 308:xxiv+392, 2006.
[10] M. M. Clementino, E. Giuli, and W. Tholen. Topology in a category: compactness. *Portugaliae Mathematica*, 53(4):397–433, 1996.
[11] C. Cohen, T. Coquand, S. Huber, and A. Mörtberg. Cubical type theory: a constructive interpretation of the univalence axiom. Available from `http://www.math.ias.edu/~amortberg/papers/cubicaltt.pdf`, 2015. Preprint.
[12] P. Gabriel and M. Zisman. *Calculus of fractions and homotopy theory*, volume 35 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*. Springer, 1967.
[13] N. Gambino and R. Garner. The identity type weak factorisation system. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 409:94–109, 2008.
[14] N. Gambino and J. Kock. Polynomial functors and polynomial monads. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 154(1):153–192, 2013.
[15] R. Garner. A homotopy-theoretic universal property of Leinster's operad for weak ω-categories. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 147:615–628, 2009.
[16] R. Garner. Understanding the small object argument. *Applied Categorical Structures*, 17(3):247–285, 2009.
[17] R. Garner. Homomorphisms of higher categories. *Advances in Mathematics*, 224(6):2269–2311, 2010.
[18] R. Garner and S. Lack. On the axioms for adhesive and quasiadhesive categories. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 27(3):27–46, 2012.
[19] M. Grandis and W. Tholen. Natural weak factorisation systems. *Archivum Mathematicum*, 42:397–408, 2006.
[20] P. Hirschhorn. *Model categories and their localizations*. American Mathematical Society, 2003.
[21] M. Hovey. *Model categories*. American Mathematical Society, 1999.
[22] S. Huber. A model of type theory in cubical sets. Licentiate of philosophy thesis, University of Gothenburg, 2015.
[23] P. Johnstone. *Sketches of an elephant: a Topos theory compendium*. Oxford Logic Guides. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 2002.
[24] A. Joyal and M. Tierney. An introduction to simplicial homotopy theory. Available from `http://hopf.math.purdue.edu/Joyal-Tierney/JT-chap-01.pdf`, 1999.
[25] A. Joyal and M. Tierney. Notes on simplicial homotopy theory. Lecture notes, available at `http://mat.uab.cat/~kock/crm/hocat/advanced-course/Quadern47.pdf`, 2008.
[26] K. Kamps and T. Porter. *Abstract homotopy and simple homotopy theory*. World Scientific Publishing Co., 1997.
[27] C. Kapulkin and Lumsdaine. The simplicial model of Univalent Foundations (after Voevodsky). arXiv:1211.2851v4, 2016.
[28] F. W. Lawvere. Equality in hyperdoctrines and comprehension schema as an adjoint functor. In *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society Symposium on Pure Mathematics XVII*, pages 1–14, 1970.
[29] I. Orton and A. M. Pitts. Axioms for modelling cubical type theory in a topos. In *25th EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL 2016)*, volume 62 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 24:1–24:19, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2016. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
[30] A. Pitts. Nominal presentation of cubical sets models of type theory. In H. Herbelin, P. Letouzey, and M. Sozeau, editors, *20th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs (TYPES 2014)*. Schloss Dagstuhl — Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2015.
[31] D. G. Quillen. *Homotopical algebra*, volume 43 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, 1967.
[32] E. Riehl and D. Verity. The theory and practice of Reedy categories. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 29(9):256–301, 2014.
[33] A. Swan. An algebraic weak factorisation system on 01-substitution sets: a constructive proof. arXiv:1409.1829, 2014.

School of Mathematics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK
E-mail address: `n.gambino@leeds.ac.uk`

School of Mathematics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK
E-mail address: `c.sattler@leeds.ac.uk`